

No 9335. Mar 186

Pts. H-9



GIVEN BY

U. S. DEPT. OF DOCUMENTS

all book

93004113
pts. 4-9

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

(EDUCATION—PART 4)

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
Congre~~House~~ <sup>Established to investigate and
erect a bill</sup> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 23 AND 27, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

November 15, 1956
*9335.4A185
pts. 4-9

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

~~JUN 21 1953~~

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

CLYDE DOYLE, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, SR., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

April 23, 1953:		
Testimony of—		Page
Norman Levinson	-----	1073
Theodora Goldstein	-----	1108
Arthur L. Levy	-----	1124
April 27, 1953:		
Testimony of—		
John Henry Reynolds	-----	1131
Courtney E. Owens	-----	1144
Index	-----	1147

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION (Education—Part 4)

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:35 a. m., in the caucus room, room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer (appearance noted in transcript), Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle (appearance noted in transcript), and James B. Frazier, Jr.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavener, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; Donald T. Appell and Courtney E. Owens, investigators; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show I have appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Clardy, Mr. Moulder, and myself as chairman, for the purposes of this hearing.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Prof. Norman Levinson.

Would you be sworn, Professor Levinson?

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. LEVINSON. I do.

TESTIMONY OF DR. NORMAN LEVINSON, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, STUART C. RAND

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you represented by counsel?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. RAND. My name is Stuart C. Rand. I am a partner in the law firm of Choate, Hall, and Stewart, with offices at 30 State Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state your full name and present address?

Dr. LEVINSON. Norman Levinson, 27 Heath's Bridge Road, Concord, Mass.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell Levinson?

Dr. LEVINSON. L-e-v-i-n-s-o-n.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born, Professor Levinson?

Dr. LEVINSON. August 11, 1912, Lynn, Mass.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you outline for the subcommittee your educational background?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. I went to the public schools of Revere, Mass. I took a bachelor's and master's degree in electrical engineering at MIT, doctor of science degree in mathematics at MIT, spent a year visiting Cambridge University in England, spent a year and a half as a national research fellow at Princeton University in the Institute for Advanced Study.

Mr. KUNZIG. Does that complete the formal education?

Dr. LEVINSON. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you outline your employment background?

Dr. LEVINSON. Since February in 1937 I have been employed by MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. In what capacity are you presently employed there?

Dr. LEVINSON. I am professor of mathematics.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you in the same department, then, as Professor Martin who testified here yesterday?

Dr. LEVINSON. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. He is the chairman of your department?

Dr. LEVINSON. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever teach at any other institution or school?

Dr. LEVINSON. No, sir. I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have always been at MIT?

Dr. LEVINSON. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were a student at MIT?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Levinson, have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; I was.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you first become a member of the party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I believe in the early fall of 1937.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you tell the subcommittee what caused you to become a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I think mainly the depression, with the unemployment that was widely prevalent at that time among my classmates, and more especially among scientists, made me think very much about the situation, and at that time I finally came to the conclusion that capitalism was not working and that perhaps the solution was socialism.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you still a member of the Communist Party, sir?

Dr. LEVINSON. I am not.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you leave the party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I sort of drifted out, and my last couple of years in the party are very hazy. I think I attended meetings very spottily. The best date I can give you on that is the spring or summer of 1945.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you out of the Communist Party before it dropped the name Communist Political Association and reverted to the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I really don't remember. That period is one in which I had considerable antagonism and dispute with some of the leaders of the Communist Party and, so, I'm very hazy on what was going on in the Communist Party at that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was the first cell or group to which you were attached?

Dr. LEVINSON. A group that met in—near Harvard Square.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was that the group at MIT or was it another group?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; no. To the best of my knowledge, there was no group at MIT at all at that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. What time are we talking about now?

Dr. LEVINSON. The fall of 1937. That is the first—

Mr. KUNZIG. Right.

Dr. LEVINSON. That is the first group.

As I remember, the people I met with were graduate students or assistants, the people very low in the academic ladder, so to speak. I was instructor at that time, and we would meet—I don't remember whether it was once a week or once in two weeks—at the apartment of one of the members.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was that the unit Robert Gorham Davis was in?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; it wasn't.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you recall any of the names of the fellow members of the Communist Party with whom you met in this group that you are now referring to?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, having read the records of the Davis testimony and having been here yesterday, I have been refreshed quite a bit on some of these names which I had certainly forgotten, actually; but I do remember—I think I remember this group better than any other group because it was the first one. It made quite an impression on me. This group met in the rooms of, I believe, Herbert Robbins and John Reynolds. I think they shared an apartment in Cambridge, and I think that is where we met.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you knew both of those men whom you mentioned as members of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the Reynolds who was mentioned here yesterday, and who is now somewhere in Florida teaching?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't know where he is. He was mentioned in Davis' testimony. I don't recall that he was mentioned yesterday, but probably he was.

Mr. KUNZIG. At this point I would like the record to show that Herbert Robbins has appeared before this committee in executive session and has cooperated fully with the committee.

Mr. VELDE. Can you recall who it was that mentioned Mr. Reynolds as a member of the Communist Party yesterday, counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe it was Professor Martin.

Are there any other members of this group—this first group—whose names you can now recall, whom you knew as members of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I believe—I'm not sure of this—well, perhaps if I am not sure, I better not say here. Not with certainty; no, sir, unless you want—I can hazard guesses; but I don't know that I should.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Paul Sweezy?

Dr. LEVINSON. I knew him as a member of the Teachers' Union at Harvard.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, what was the next group to which you belonged after the one you have just mentioned?

Dr. LEVINSON. I really can't remember. It seems to me that these groups were constantly in a state of flux and that sometimes Harvard people met with MIT people; sometimes they didn't; sometimes there was a question of neighborhood groups, and so on.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you belong to many different groups?

Dr. LEVINSON. It seems to me that I belonged to a number of different groups; yes, sir.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you recall any of the names—is it too confused in your mind today, or can you remember some of the names—of the groups and some of the members of these groups to which you belonged?

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I don't believe I can remember at this moment any more people than the ones that have already been mentioned.

Mr. KUNZIG. In your first group, did you know a Jack Rackliffe—R-a-c-k-l-i-f-f-e?

Dr. LEVINSON. I knew the man. I don't at all recall whether he was in that group or not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he in one of your groups? In other words, did you know him as a Communist?

Dr. LEVINSON. I believe he was.

Mr. KUNZIG. How about Russ A. Nixon—N-i-x-o-n?

Dr. LEVINSON. I remember him as a member of the Teachers' Union.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you remember him as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; I do not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, did you belong, in one of the groups you mentioned, to the group at MIT which was testified to here yesterday?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; I belonged to that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you name for the committee the other members of that group?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, let's see—there was—there were the two men who testified yesterday, and Arguimbau¹—

Mr. KUNZIG. That is Martin,² Arguimbau—

Dr. LEVINSON. And Amdur³—

Mr. KUNZIG. And Amdur?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

And Blaisdell.

Mr. KUNZIG. Blaisdell?⁴

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who was mentioned here yesterday?

¹ Lawrence Arguimbau.

² William Ted Martin.

³ Isadore Amdur.

⁴ B. E. Blaisdell.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any other members of that group that you recall as members of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Let's see—Gelbart that was mentioned here yesterday. I remember him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you have any knowledge whether Gelbart is still a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. In 1946 or 1947—I believe it was 1946—I can't be quite sure of that—Mr. Gelbart told me that he had left the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. How about Professor Dirk Struik?

Dr. LEVINSON. Professor Dirk Struik, I think, was a member of that group at various times.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you knew him as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. At least I remember him as a member of the group.

Mr. KUNZIG. And the group was an organization of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, actually, if you want to get technical on this, there is quite a bit confusion. I believe there was one man who attended meetings of the first group in Robbins' room who was not a member. At least I believe Robbins so informed me, and I think there was no reason why he shouldn't have been telling me the story straight.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you heard testimony here yesterday with regard to the secrecy of this group. What is your connection with the secret—

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I, personally, was rather outspoken in my beliefs and I don't think anybody who knew me at that time had any doubts about my beliefs. If they were willing to stand to listen, I would be ready to talk their ear off.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, did the officials of your university at MIT know that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, they certainly didn't know me personally. I think some of the older men on the staff knew very well from the way I talked about things.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean they knew you were a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I don't know that they knew it in such terms. You see, this was a different period. People were much less conscious of this sort of thing.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Dr. LEVINSON. But they certainly knew it at that time, as in socialism, as it was advocated by the Communists, and at that time I was very sympathetic to the position of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, did you have a card in the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't remember having a card.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you have an alias or any other name under which you went in the party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I believe I went under my own name.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Professor Levinson, you stated that you had been a member of many different groups, and you have also stated you were quite a joiner, so to speak.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; that's correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. There are various, different parts of that period I would like to question you about.

The Daily Worker of March 19, 1942, contains a story, starting on page 1, with reference to 38 noted educators joining in a petition to President Roosevelt urging the pardon of Earl Browder, who at that time was head of the Communist Party of the United States. One of the names listed as signing this is Norman Levinson, assistant professor of mathematics, MIT. I presume you were the Norman Levinson.

Dr. LEVINSON. That's me.

I don't believe I was a noted educator, but that is me.

I was active on the Committee To Free Earl Browder; that is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you state to the committee why you were active to free Earl Browder in 1942?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I have always been interested in civil liberties, and I still am. I thought that the Browder sentence was rather severe for the charge. I believe I read a report of some attorney to the effect that on similar charges the steepest sentence before this was 1 year. I guess he got a 4-year sentence. That was the civil-liberty basis on it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, contains a reproduction of an open letter to the President of the United States in behalf of Harry Bridges, who at that time was under an order of deportation by the Attorney General of the United States. One of the persons identified as signing that was also this Prof. Norman Levinson. Was that you?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I don't remember this. I remember the Earl Browder business, but I don't remember Bridges; but I am sure it was. I was in this thing, and I was quite ready to let the world know.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were one of the 600 Americans who signed this, and you were at that time appealing in behalf of Harry Bridges?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, could you—

Dr. LEVINSON. At least I am quite willing to believe that. It fits in.

Mr. KUNZIG. I will show this to you.

Dr. LEVINSON. That is O. K.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state to the committee why you were appealing for Harry Bridges in 1942?

Dr. LEVINSON. I must say I don't remember the details of that case at all. It's 11 years ago, and I presume—

Mr. KUNZIG. You must have—

Dr. LEVINSON. Presumably it was tied in with my being a member of the Communist Party and sympathetic in general to the program of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, you must have known, didn't you, as a professor at a great university, your name would lend great influence and weight in a list of this nature?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. Well, unquestionably whatever the statement says—I believed it, and was ready to support it. Of course, I supported it as an individual—not as a—not as a member of the faculty.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were your actions influenced by your membership in the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I'm sure they were.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you say that the actions of many such people who signed petitions of this nature are directed, from behind the scenes, by the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. My actions weren't directed by the Communist Party.

Before 1942 I had had some serious disputes on various irrefutable questions with people pretty high up in the Communist Party.

And some of the people in the party, like Amdur and Martin, who were here yesterday, never signed things like this. This was purely an individual matter.

The signing of things of this nature never took place in Communist cell meetings. I got on the mailing list of a number of these things; and since I did answer a number of them favorably, I got on more mailing lists. These things broke pretty fast.

But it wasn't a question of being directed by the Communist Party as such. I think it was more a question of my sympathies at that time.

Mr. VELDE. Well, do you now feel, Doctor, that the letters, original instructions, came from the Communist Party, that is, the source of the pressure that was put out at that time to have you sign these various letters and requests, and so forth, came from the American Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I know much more about the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder than I do the Bridges committee. I don't remember the Bridges committee at all; but, as I recall it—and my memory is rather vague—as I recall it, I think the local Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder was definitely Communist inspired.

I think, also, a certain number of very sincere civil liberties people joined in that, perfectly—Americans who were not at all Communists or sympathetic with communism; but I think the original impetus for that came from the Communists.

Mr. CLARDY. A typical Communist trick to get a few respectable non-Communist names on everything they can; isn't it?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; it certainly is.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you feel today, going back to this matter concerning Earl Browder that we mentioned a moment ago, that Earl Browder's obtaining a passport fraudulently was a minor offense? In other words, at that time you apparently did; but do you today, now that you are no longer a Communist, think that the obtaining of a passport to use illegally outside of this country for Communist activities, and so forth, was a minor offense?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I don't know how seriously to weigh the offense. As I remember it at the time, the information that was given out by, I think, competent lawyers, although I am not qualified to judge their competence, was that in previous cases of this sort people got sentences of about 1 year, that no one had ever got a 4-year sentence, that the 4-year sentence was very severe. That was the sort of thing—the weighing of the crime by the sentence.

Mr. KUNZIG. But today, now that you are not a Communist—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you feel that it is unimportant and minor?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; I don't think it is unimportant, and I didn't think it was at that time unimportant.

Mr. KUNZIG. Today would you have signed such a document?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I am a strong civil-liberties man. I am still a member of the American Civil Liberties Union, and I would support any such cause if the American Civil Liberties Union thought it worthwhile.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of the American Civil Liberties Union when you were a Communist?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't really recall.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you become a member of the American Civil Liberties Union?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't know. I would have to go back to my check-book and see.

I have never been an active member of the American Civil Liberties Union. I have never actively participated. I have never been to a meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union in my life.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, the open letter to which we have just referred was sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties at 1123 Broadway, New York, N. Y. They prepared a booklet reproducing this open letter and also reproducing the names of the signers. Now, I want to ask you if you still concur in a finding and a demand set forth in this open letter, which says:

It is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded.

In other words, this was openly asking for, supposedly, support for Harry Bridges, but tucked down very nicely inside was this defense of the Communist Party—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. And that was—

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Signed by Prof. Norman Levinson.

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't know what action was referred to. You read me the one sentence.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't know the whole statement.

Mr. KUNZIG. I will gladly show it to you.

Dr. LEVINSON. May I see it?

Mr. KUNZIG. Certainly; take a look at it.

It is the same statement we talked about a moment ago.

Dr. LEVINSON. I see.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let the record show I have given the witness Levinson exhibit No. 1, marked so for identification.

You will recall, I am sure, Professor Levinson, this document.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. I have read this. I don't remember the document, but I see it now.

Well, since I was at that time a member of the Communist Party I certainly agreed with most of the things that are in that document.

That, of course, was during the time we were in the war, allied with Russia, among other things.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you feel today that the Communist Party is a conspiracy?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; I do feel that today.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain in a bit more detail your viewpoint as to the Communist Party today, now that you are an ex-member?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. Well, I learned over the years that I—

Mr. MOULDER. May I, at this point, Mr. Chairman, ask him a question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. When you ceased to be a member of the Communist Party, what date was that—approximately?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, it's very approximate. You see, I sort of petered out on the thing, and the best date I can give to that is the middle of 1945. It is not at all a sure date, but it's—

Mr. MOULDER. Were you paying dues up until that date; that is, from the early fall of 1937 up until the middle of the year 1945?

Dr. LEVINSON (continuing). As I recall—

Mr. MOULDER. During all that period?

Dr. LEVINSON (continuing). As I recall, I paid dues through that period; that is right.

Mr. MOULDER. And you were an active member of the party during all of that period of time?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, sometimes inactive; at other times active.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, were you a record or card-carrying member of the party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Not a card-carrying member. I regarded myself as a member, and during most of that time I attended meetings; that is right.

Mr. CLARDY. The card wasn't really essential to membership?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; it is a matter of attitude basically, feeling you are a member of a group and working in the group. That is the essential thing.

Mr. CLARDY. Sometimes they used the card as a method of collecting dues, by affixing stamps to the card—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Or are you familiar with that?

Dr. LEVINSON. I have a vague recollection of stamps; I do.

Mr. CLARDY. The committee has a number of exhibits—

Dr. LEVINSON. I see.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Of that kind.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. But you didn't have that?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't remember whether I did or didn't.

Mr. CLARDY. You were sure you were a Communist—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Even if you didn't have credentials?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; there is no question about that.

Mr. MOULDER. I merely wanted to bring up that one point, Mr. Counsel, and ask a question concerning his membership.

Mr. VELDE. Yes, and can you recall your question, Mr. Counsel, and repeat the question?

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe my question was, What is your present viewpoint with regard to the Communist Party, and whether it is a conspiracy, and so forth.

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I wouldn't—I don't know whether every person who is in the Communist Party at this time realizes it, every member realizes it—but it seems to me that my experience in the Communist Party, particularly the contact I had with the leadership, would indicate these people are not independent minded at all; that they tend to follow very much the line that comes out from Moscow; that they are essentially puppets. They have given up their independence of mind and they don't think for themselves any more.

That was the reaction that I got over the years.

Mr. SCHERER. A man in the educational field who alines himself with the Communist Party gives up his academic freedom, then?

DR. LEVINSON. Well, it all depends. You see, after all, a man who was born and educated in this country doesn't do that very easily. The leaders in the Communist Party, as I recall, certainly were of that cast of mind; but it seems to me I can remember rather strong disputes between some of the academic people and some of the leadership on various questions.

You see, a man—a man can't be forced at the point of a gun to remain a Communist. I think sometimes the Communist leadership put up, shall we say—I don't know how it is now, but at least at that time they put up with what we regard as some of the idiosyncrasies and some of the independence of individuals in order to be able, as I see it now, to use them as much as they could for their purposes; but I think many of the people retained a very considerable amount of their integrity, and I think the best proof of that is the fact that, although—

MR. SCHERER. They leave the party?

DR. LEVINSON (continuing). Yes.

Top Communist Party membership, I think, was a hundred thousand, there was a big turnover. So, there must have been literally thousands of people who passed through the party, and I believe I saw a statement by J. Edgar Hoover that the membership now is less than 25,000. So, most of the people did retain their integrity and somehow they saw at some point this is not at all what they thought it was and they got out.

MR. SCHERER. Because they learned if they continued to follow the party line they would have to give up their academic freedom; is that right?

DR. LEVINSON. Well, I mean most of the people in there certainly were not teachers. I mean, most of the—

MR. SCHERER. Well, let's talk about teachers.

DR. LEVINSON. Yes.

Well, yes; there were various things that would be disturbing to a teacher in any democracy. For example, there was the Communist Party line on music. For some reason or another, Stalin and some of his henchmen set themselves up as great critics of music. The whole thing is absolutely ridiculous. I think music, like any other field, should be a free-enterprise field. I think people should write the music they want to write. If they get an audience, fine. If they don't get an audience, one doesn't bring one in for them at gunpoint, and so on.

Another difficult question that arose was in the field of biology. I am not a biologist and I wouldn't even attempt to decide on the merits of the dispute in genetics, but what disturbed me very much about the dispute was that the Communist government in Russia took an official position that one side was right and one side was wrong. It doesn't matter whether the position they took was right or wrong. Most geneticists, I believe, feel the government in that case took the wrong position. That isn't the important thing. The important thing is that it is the death of science if the government mixes in and it has an official position in science. Science can't go that way. Science has to be absolutely open, free; ideas have to compete, be thrown around between men and survive if they meet the test, and if they don't meet the test they go. No scientist can subscribe to any government science.

Mr. CLARDY. That is, any scientist who is not a Communist?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I think on this particular rock the Communist Party lost a tremendous number of people in the long run.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, that separated the men from the boys, more or less, didn't it?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, a man with, say, your educational qualifications and background, Doctor, who would remain in the Communist Party, after all that has transpired and after all the light that has been thrown on the Communist conspiracy in this country—wouldn't that individual, if he remains a strong party member today, have to give up his academic freedom?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I believe there are some things that show now. I don't know about today, but even in fairly recent years that isn't quite the case. My feeling is that a man who remains a Communist today should have his mind examined, in that he is probably a rather maladjusted individual or else a man who is blind in certain areas, who lives in a dream world and doesn't recognize reality; and there are such people.

I think there was one case that came up—

Mr. SCHERER. Could I interrupt there?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Put it this way: Doesn't the Communist Party line today prevent academic freedom, if you followed the line?

Dr. LEVINSON. If you followed the line; but I was going to give an example, apparently of a man who—

Mr. SCHERER. Your answer to that question would be yes?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; I was going to give an example of a man who did—

Mr. SCHERER. I am not talking about an individual. I am talking about—

Dr. LEVINSON. I am talking about an individual Communist Party member who apparently was very honest. This occurred at the University of Washington. He told the faculty, when he was asked, yes, he was a member of the Communist Party. They investigated his teaching, and it turned out that he always told the class that he had this strong Marxist bias.

I will say such a man, of course, is not the typical Communist. He would never be a leader in the Communist Party. He wouldn't survive 3 weeks in the Soviet Union.

But there are individuals like that. Heaven knows why that man is a member of the Communist Party. I don't, but somewhere underneath is a man who retains a certain amount of integrity. I think by now he has got out. I think a man like that would—will get out of the party; will wake up and see the kind of organization he is in.

Mr. CLARDY. That is one of the main reasons why there is such a large turnover, then, you think, in the ranks of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't know there is much of a turnover now. My suspicion now is that people are coming out, and I can't understand, for the life of me, why anybody would ever come in.

Mr. CLARDY. One former Communist told me the other day that there are somewhere around 700,000 ex-Communists in the country.

I don't vouch for that figure. He told me that. If that is the case, it would indicate a pretty large turnover, wouldn't it?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. I would think, on the basis—I haven't checked this, but I would think, on the basis—on the basis of figures, there must be certainly several hundred thousand. I don't know exactly what it would be. Certainly there must be several hundred thousand ex-Communists.

In other words, communism is a disease that doesn't take well in the American environment. We have a very high degree of immunity, I think, and I think it speaks for the health of our society.

Mr. CLARDY. It is an immunity that can be broken down if the Communist Party continues to work on the program it has laid out; is that not so?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't believe so. I believe that the Communist Party is going to just die out. I think it is on the downhill. I don't think the Communist Party, on its own, has a chance of getting anywhere in a democratic country. I think without the bayonets of the Russian Army it won't get anywhere.

Mr. CLARDY. You don't concede there is a possibility that if we let down our guard the Communists can succeed?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I will say this: I don't think the Communists in this country are going to succeed in any way in increasing the size of their party at all.

I think the people who are in the Communist Party now might well be used, if the Communists could so use them, for all kinds of infiltrating work in the Government, in the Army, and so on.

I think it's very important that we have the Justice Department, the FBI, watching that. I think if we weren't watching that—I think most of the membership would probably have infiltrated all kinds of key positions.

I think that is the danger. I think the danger is that these people will go underground.

I don't think there's any real danger if they stay above ground. I think above ground we can compete with them in any open competition. I don't think they have a chance in a democratic country at this point.

I think the Soviet Union has exposed itself pretty well. I think that most people recognize that the leaders of the Soviet Union are essentially a bunch of gangsters, who deal with human lives with no regard whatsoever for the integrity of the individual, just send men, to suit themselves, to slave labor camps, cemeteries, prisons, and so on; and I think people realize that by now, and I don't think they can regard this whole movement as being an idealistic movement or being a desirable movement, or anything else.

I think they recognize that the dictatorship has remained in the Soviet Union; that while originally the promise of the Communists was democracy, it's never come and there seems to be no sign of it whatsoever. It's a totalitarian government.

Mr. VELDE. Doctor, I certainly enjoy your viewpoint. I think you are giving us some information that we haven't had up to this time.

I feel that you are a very loyal and fine American citizen, and I want to call to your attention—I don't know whether you know anything about it or not—that there has operated in this country an

espionage ring—a Soviet espionage ring—involving quite a few of the hard core of the American Communist Party.

I take it from your testimony that you were not involved in that part of the Communist conspiracy in any way?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, that's certainly so. I mean, as you can see from some of these exhibits, I was very noisy and open in my membership of the Communist Party, and I was not aware of the existence of this underground.

I have read later—I've read Whittaker Chambers' book and Elizabeth Bentley's reports, and so on. So, I realize the Communists were doing espionage work right along.

Mr. VELDE. Well, now, when you speak of the underground, do you refer to the Soviet espionage system as it has been operating here under the control of the American Communist Party and the Soviet diplomatic service here?

Dr. LEVINSON. What I say is that the real danger in the Communist Party is the 24 or 25,000 members may have a certain percentage—maybe it's a quarter of them, or a third of them—I don't know that—a certain percentage of them may well be willing to, if they could, infiltrate sensitive positions, and I think it's rather important that we have our eyes on that. I think that is the real danger. I think that is what we have to watch for as far as the American Communists are concerned.

Mr. VELDE. In other words, you feel that as far as the indirect attempt of the Soviet Government, operating through the American Communist Party, to change our system of government is not a real threat at the present time?

Dr. LEVINSON. No, sir. I feel as long as it's aboveboard—I think they don't have a chance.

I think our democracy is very healthy. I think these people can preach their theories from the street corners, if they want to. I don't think they will make a dent.

Mr. CLARDY. You don't think all of the Communist Party activities or all of its members are aboveground at this moment, do you?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I don't know. I would suspect they are not.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, let's assume some of them are underground.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. If that is the case, you would, I assume, agree with the committee that there is a very real present danger?

Dr. LEVINSON. I wouldn't say any Communists who are not aboveground—I mean, the ones who are underground—I certainly hope the FBI is in contact with them and keeping an eye on them.

Mr. CLARDY. If we had just one more Alger Hiss somewhere placed in the Government, he could do quite a lot of damage, couldn't he?

Dr. LEVINSON. It all depends. I think in some places a man like that could be a dangerous man.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I mean.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. If he is in a place of importance, he might do a great deal of harm to the entire national cause, so that the number, the actual number of Communists, doesn't really give us any accurate appreciation of how dangerous or how nondangerous they may be?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. I would say the real danger is precisely in their trying to infiltrate places—in being secret, hidden, and trying to infil-

trate places. As long as they announce themselves or work above-ground, then I think we're quite immune to them; and I think, as a matter of fact, any Communist who really enters such a situation is in considerable danger, as a Communist, of finding himself converted to something else. I think if he associates with Americans in an organization he may find, over the years, that he changes his mind; and apparently most have—that they, associating with healthy Americans—they've come around and dropped out of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. Of course, while I appreciate a great deal of what you have said, I think what you have been telling us leaves one factor out of consideration that I would like to hear your comment on, and it is this: The Communists use a great many front organizations to influence American thinking, through books and magazines, newspapers, and plays, what have you. Have you had or given any thought to the fact that a great deal of the Communist Party work in this Nation may be carried on more effectively by these fronts than by the party workers, themselves?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, certain of the things these fronts do I think most people would be very opposed to. I think if a front organization happens to be supporting something that many people are in favor of they will attract a certain amount of support, and the goal itself, in rare instances, might—might even be a worthy one. I think, though, that most people have become fairly sophisticated in this and, if there is some worthwhile goal they would like to work for, they find some way of doing it outside of the Communist Party, outside of any Communist-front organization.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. First, I would like to make the comment that espionage is not necessarily confined to members of the Communist Party. There may be many persons practicing espionage in this country that have no loyalty to any country or to any political party.

As I understand, your opinion, then, as expressed to Mr. Clardy, is that communism, as an immediate threat or as a conspiracy, as a threat to our Government, internally, in this country, within our own boundaries, is not what you call a dangerous threat?

Dr. LEVINSON. The open part of the movement—

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Dr. LEVINSON (continuing). I do not regard as dangerous. I feel that part has been shrinking rapidly—

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Dr. LEVINSON. And I think we are quite immune to it.

Mr. MOULDER. But internationally, as a world movement, supported by the Soviets, it does constitute a threat throughout the world?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; supported by the Soviets, it constitutes a threat throughout the world.

Those places where it constitutes a threat in general are depressed areas, overpopulated areas, and so on, and there, of course, the American Communist Party, as such, plays no role of particular importance.

I think the only way to cope with that situation is to try to help some of these—these backward nations overcome their—their difficulties and become healthy, democratic societies.

I think in a healthy, democratic society communism doesn't have a chance.

Mr. KUNZIG. Shall I proceed, sir?

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. I am glad Congressman Moulder asked those last questions, Professor, because I think there was a slightly unfortunate interpretation that could be taken from your testimony so far that the Communist Party consists of just a few maladjusted crackpots.

You would agree, I take it, that any group or any opinion, any such thing as communism, any ideas such as that, that can arouse millions and millions of people throughout the world to its side can't be ignored as a group of maladjusted crackpots.

Dr. LEVINSON. I think in this country it consists of a group of largely maladjusted crackpots, and I think perhaps a psychiatric examination would reveal that; but I think for an American person who is really in contact, a man who hasn't withdrawn into himself and is really in contact in this life—to be a Communist, I think today he must be a man with serious—with serious personal deficiencies somewhere.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you said—

Mr. SCHERER. Will you pardon me?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. It might interest you to know we have had before us—I have only been a member of this committee a short time, but we have had before us—professors and doctors from some of our leading universities, still teaching, who are members of the Communist Party; and you say they would need psychiatric examination?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes, sir; I say so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now you also said the bayonets of the Russian Army—

Mr. SCHERER. Pardon me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. They shouldn't be teaching, then, should they, under those conditions?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, it all depends. I can conceive of a man in need of serious psychiatric attention who might be a very good teacher of theoretical physics or a very good mathematician; and I think the students—I think the American students—are a pretty healthy lot. I don't think anybody can lead them astray very easily. I think they could take the man's physics, size him up for what he was otherwise, and reject the rest of him.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, Professor, as I recall it—you can correct me, Mr. Chairman—Professor Davis made a very fine impression upon me—one of the first witnesses I listened to—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; Robert Davis—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). As a member of this committee—

Dr. LEVINSON. I know him.

Mr. SCHERER. In my opinion, he is a gentleman of your caliber, who was a former member of the Communist Party, and he concluded his testimony, if my recollection is correct, by saying that, in his opinion, any man who remains in the Communist Party today, after all that has transpired and with all the information we have about the party, is an agent or a potential agent of the Soviet Union.

Now, I am not asking you whether you agree with that or not, but I thought you might be interested to know that was his testimony—

Dr. LEVINSON. I think—

Mr. SCHERER. And others—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Have testified similar to that.

Dr. LEVINSON. I think Hicks—Granville Hicks—was the man who used those words. I read all the testimony. I think it was Hicks, and I think Hicks said—put stress on the word "potential."

In other words, in our judicial system, unlike the Russian judicial system, we always try the individual. We always think in terms of the individual. I think we have to give the individual a break. So, I think stress should be put on the word "potential." I wouldn't want to say everybody that is in the Communist Party now is a Russian agent. I would like to think many of them, if they were faced with that cold—just coldly faced with that—choice would withdraw. I would like to think that. I don't know if they would.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, you may be right as to it being Hicks.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. But Hicks has perhaps an educational background equal to that of Davis.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. He has a much longer experience in the Communist Party than Davis.

Mr. SCHERER. Much longer?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. And he was at Harvard?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; he was at Harvard for 1 year.

(Representative Kit Clardy left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Levinson, in January 1943, a petition was submitted to the House of Representatives seeking discontinuance of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, referred to in the petition as the Dies committee. Now, of course, while I agree anybody has a right to petition Congress for anything they may so desire, our interest is whether or not this petition was greatly backed or maybe actually started by the Communist Party.

I will pass it over to you, marked "Levinson exhibit No. 2" for identification.

Dr. LEVINSON. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe you are listed as a signer there.

Dr. LEVINSON. It is quite possible. I don't remember the thing. Thanks. I've scanned it. Thank you.

Well, there are several things to say. For one thing, at that time I was a member of the Communist Party. That certainly must be taken into consideration with reference to my signature there.

For another thing, of course, at that time we were allied with Russia, fighting Hitler. I think at that particular time Hitler was making great progress, so that I thought perhaps—I suppose I thought—I don't remember that thing—I thought perhaps at that time the thing to do was not to hammer at the moment on the Communist thing. I am sure since I was a member of the Communist Party—I am sure I thought at that time it was the wrong thing to do entirely.

Mr. KUNZIG. My question would be, to continue further, whether it isn't true, as a fact, that a great number of Communists pressed this type of petition?

Dr. LEVINSON. Certainly. Certainly; there is no question about that.

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. It was pushed and backed by the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't remember this petition specifically, but it is the sort of thing the Communists had to do, undoubtedly; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Because they didn't want to be exposed—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; I am sure that is right.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Or to have the American public know of their activities?

Dr. LEVINSON. On the other hand, I wouldn't want to say all petitions of all kinds are Communist petitions.

Mr. KUNZIG. No; certainly we agree with you.

This petition to the Congress was also sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. Was it this organization that solicited your support, if you remember?

Dr. LEVINSON. I certainly don't remember.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Levinson, on September 26, 1944, the issue of the New Masses contains a story by you entitled "A Mathematician on Browder." Can you recall any of the steps taken by you or others in connection with the publication of this? Was this Communist inspired?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; it certainly wasn't. I received—I was a subscriber to the New Masses, and I also, as some of the exhibits you've brought forth here indicate—I was also quite a signer, and apparently the editors of the New Masses got my name from some list and sent me a book—I believe it was called—Victory in Africa.

You have the thing there. You can probably check that. I think that is right.

Is that right?

Mr. APPELL. Our Paths in War and Peace.

Dr. LEVINSON. Oh, Our Paths in War and Peace.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you want to look at this?

Dr. LEVINSON. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. I hand the witness a document marked "Levinson exhibit No. 3" for identification.

Dr. LEVINSON. Oh, this—yes, this book was called Teheran—Path of War and Peace. I remember.

Thank you very much.

Yes—well, on the whole, as I remember this book, the program put forth by Mr. Browder was a rather admirable one. He saw a rather rosy picture of the world at peace, and so on. I think, as a result of this book, he was later thrown out of the Communist Party—I think strictly on orders from Moscow. However, there was one—

Mr. SCHERER. What was that last? I didn't quite get that. Strictly by orders from Moscow?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; I am sure when Browder was thrown out of the Communist Party it was because the Moscow people didn't approve of this line he had taken. He painted a rather peaceful, happy picture of the world after the war was ended, and I think he was thrown out.

There was one difference I had with Browder that was brought forth in that article, and that is in connection with the economic situation in the United States after the war. He thought we would have to export, in terms of those dollars, at that time, about \$20 billion of goods a year in order to keep full employment. By the time that article was written I had ceased believing in Marxian economics and had gone

over to modern economics, and it was my contention that an export of \$5 billion, in terms of dollars at that time, should certainly keep us on a pretty good economic keel. I didn't think we would need any more than that. This was net export.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor, I believe you wanted to make a comment about the son or sons of Mr. Browder.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. If so, would you care to do so now?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. I want to thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to do this. I was rather upset yesterday when the name of Felix Browder, the oldest son—I don't know the other son particularly well—the oldest son of the former Communist, Earl Browder, was mentioned. The question was raised whether he had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

I know this boy very well. He came to MIT at the age of 16, with a brilliant record. He got through MIT in 2 years. He is the best student we had ever had in mathematics in MIT in the 90 years of existence of the institution. He had a brilliant career at Princeton. He is about 25 or 26 now, and I regard him as one of the most brilliant mathematicians in the world. He is certainly a much better mathematician than I am or Dr. Martin, who was here yesterday.

On the other hand, it is also true—I have talked with him a lot; I know him very well—he has been anti-Communist. He has opposed criticism of music in the Soviet Union; the genetics business. He regards the group running Russia as a bunch of dictators, unscrupulous men, and so on, and has said so.

I know that he's prepared at any time to sign a sworn statement that he isn't and has never been a member of the Communist Party.

I believe that a man of his qualifications is a real asset to this country. He is really a great scientist, and I think it's in the American spirit to give a man like that a chance, not to visit the sins of his father on him.

Actually, he's had a terrible time getting a position, and some of the great scientists of our country have tried to help him. The schools and universities of this country have a severe public-relations problem. They are not self-supporting. They do a great service. They turn out scientists, physicians and so on; but it costs more than they take in, in tuition. They are rather frightened of his name, and it's easy to see why they are. They are afraid it will reduce contributions, and so on. So, he has had a very difficult time of it.

In spite of this, he is turning out remarkably good work. He is in a field—a field of partial differential equations, which is a field in which the laws of radar, jet propulsion, atomic fission, all the basic laws of physics are expressed. He has made many new discoveries, and I think it would be very nice indeed if we could be American enough to give a fellow like that a chance.

Mr. VELDE. You say he is in the field of differential equations?

Dr. LEVINSON. Partial differential equations. He is in that field, making contributions. He is a young man, making great contributions, outstanding.

Mr. VELDE. I was interested in your statement. I don't know that I got it exactly right. You said Earl Browder was an ex-Communist?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Well, in what category would you place him?

I have been thinking of the testimony that he gave or didn't give before the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate about 3 weeks ago, or a month ago.

What category would you place Earl Browder in at the present time?

Dr. LEVINSON. I only know from his writings. There was an article, I think, in the New York Herald Tribune several weeks ago—I think the rather famous correspondent, Vickery Higgins, had an interview with him, and he made some rather interesting remarks. One of the things he said was he is not unappreciative of his rights in American democracy. He said that he realized full well if he was in the—had been in the opposition in the Soviet Union, the way he was here, he would have ended up in the cemetery, a prison or, at best, a slave-labor camp.

He did make those statements. I think he is beginning to see the light.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to thank the professor for coming forward in this very frank statement based upon his personal knowledge of this fellow American. I hope the time will never come when this committee gets an attitude that a man is either un-American or a Communist merely by association. That is in itself inconsistent with the highest American traditions and justice.

Mr. VELDE. You are referring there, Mr. Doyle—

Mr. DOYLE. I am referring to the son of Earl Browder.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

If I may say another word about the son, I think there is a certain lesson there.

I wonder if I have the permission of the committee to say a few words about that.

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I think that in our system of government one of the great things is that a man is regarded as innocent until proved guilty. If we have 11 men and 10 are known to be criminals and 1 is known not to be a criminal, we do not slap the 11 men into jail.

In the Soviet Union, they do things the other way around, of course. We know that very well. They play with human lives. The individual counts for nothing.

I think, therefore, what happened yesterday when the names of these boys were mentioned was a very upsetting thing.

You see, when the schools are hesitating whether or not they can dare take on—whether they can dare hire a boy like Felix Browder—

Mr. SCHERER. What is his first name?

Dr. LEVINSON. Felix.

They sort of say, "Can we do this? We have a public relations problem. We depend on alumni and on public-spirited citizens for money. Will they be offended if we have a man like this on our staff?"

If the name of such a man is just mentioned as a question in this committee, unfortunately it is a terribly damaging thing.

I think it would be a wonderful thing if this committee could avoid somehow—I know you are a committee of Congress and I know you have a job to do, but if somehow you could arrange things so that

names of men like that were not raised in public like this it would be a great service to the individual; and I think—I think, as Americans, we should try to operate on that basis, to protect the individual, until we know definitely that he is guilty.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, now, doctor, I have been very much impressed by your statement with reference to Felix Browder. I knew nothing about Felix Browder until I heard you testify.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is no question in my mind that the doctor is telling the truth about Felix Browder. I think—

Mr. VELDE. Pardon me, if I may interrupt—

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask.

Mr. VELDE. The Chair would like to make a statement.

The question came up yesterday—

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; I know.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). With reference to membership, as I recall it, of Felix Browder in the Communist Party.

Dr. LEVINSON. That's right. That question was asked.

Mr. VELDE. I would like to make a statement for the record, and for the press, public, at this time, that I am sure the committee did not intend, by any means, to indicate that Felix Browder was a member of the Communist Party or interested in the Communist movement.

As I recall, the witness who answered the question yesterday said that, on the contrary, Felix Browder was anti-Communist.

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't remember the witness said that, but I think— you see—

Mr. SCHERER. May I—

Dr. LEVINSON. Certainly.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Carry this a bit further, as I started to do before the chairman interrupted?

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

Mr. SCHERER. I would like to carry the thought I had in mind just a little further.

I think it would be a good thing, particularly in view of the doctor's testimony, if we now, as a committee, Mr. Chairman, had our staff check what the doctor said so we would be in a position, this committee, to issue a statement, as a committee statement, of a later date, with reference to Felix Browder.

I make that merely as a suggestion.

Mr. VELDE. I think probably that should be taken up in—

Mr. SCHERER. Well—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Executive session.

Mr. SCHERER. I am not saying we should decide it now, but it is just my feeling—

Mr. VELDE. Yes; I think the committee is in general agreement regarding the mentioning of names before it, and we do everything we can to clarify the situation with regard to membership in the Communist Party of any person that is mentioned; and if Mr. Browder, Mr. Felix Browder—

Dr. LEVINSON. Mr. Felix Browder; yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Feels that he has been damaged by the committee in any way, we will certainly give him an opportunity to come forth and explain his anti-Communist work, or his—

Dr. LEVINSON. It isn't his work, sir. He works only in mathematics. It's just his thinking.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, how was the question asked yesterday?

Mr. VELDE. Well, I don't recall the exact wording of the question, or the exact answer, but I do recall that—

Mr. MOULDER. Evidently—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Whoever was asked a question made a very positive statement concerning the fact that Felix Browder was not a member of the Communist Party and, to the contrary—

Mr. MOULDER. Evidently there was no basis for asking the question—and that is your point.

Dr. LEVINSON. That is my point.

My interest is this: You see, unfortunately, I come from Boston, from Cambridge, actually, where there are several universities. I know the point of view of the universities and trustees a little bit. I am a professor there. I know a little bit of their problem. I place a number of young men, and a number of young men do their work under me. I know their placing problem. I know this committee has a job. I know its point of view. What I am trying to do—and the committee is certainly being very kind in letting me do this—is to point out to the committee there is another side of the coin that we in the remote areas from Washington have to face, and that is this: Unfortunately, the public attitude is such that any man who is mentioned here the universities get scared of, no matter in what light he was mentioned.

I could praise some young man and say he is the greatest anti-Communist in the world. The universities get a little scared of him. "His name was mentioned before the Un-American Activities Committee," they say.

So, I think for that reason it would be much better if names, especially of a young man like that, weren't mentioned in public, if at all possible.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Doctor, I—

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

Doctor, I will have to disagree with you on that statement. You have a right to your own opinion, but I think the faculties and the administrative officials of all of our universities do not take into consideration the fact that a person is mentioned before this committee, regardless of whether they are members of the Communist Party or in any way engaged in subversive activities, as the basis for discharging any of their employees. They look into the matter—and, of course, they do look into it on the basis of information, I suppose, that is produced before our committee and other committees of Congress; but certainly I can't agree with you when you say any person that is mentioned before this committee—

Mr. MOULDER. He refers to the publicity.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. He refers to the mention of the name and the publicity given to it.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. I am not talking about being discharged. I am talking about a young man who is in a temporary position and still has to look for a permanent job.

This is the position of a young man: You see, he doesn't have a regular job. He has a 1 or 2-year appointment. He has to look for a regular job somewhere. If his name has come up with any kind of publicity at all, the natural reaction from an administrator who doesn't want to look for trouble is to avoid hiring the man.

I have had this experience very definitely in placing men.

Mr. SCHERER. Well—

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHERER. Oh, go ahead.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. SCHERER. He was interrupted before.

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't quite hear all the remarks of our fellow member, Mr. Scherer, a minute ago, because he sits at the far end of the committee, and I at this end; but if I understood him to suggest that there ought to be a rule whereby no name is mentioned before this committee unless there is an established connection with the Communist Party, as a groundwork for that question, I will say that I am very definitely under the belief that we have that rule now—

Mr. VELDE. I am sorry. I was—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And that that is an established rule of this committee.

In fact, I remember it was brought up in the very first executive committee meeting of this committee, this session of Congress, and it is an established rule.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand that is the rule—

Mr. DOYLE. Now, then—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). But sometimes in the testimony, Mr. Doyle—

Mr. DOYLE. Well—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Of other people—

Mr. DOYLE. I want to say—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Names are mentioned.

Mr. DOYLE. Yesterday I was present in the subcommittee with our distinguished chairman, Mr. Velde, and I thought that question was asked certainly with no intention to harm inadvertently and accidentally, shall we say, the young man, and with no intention of violation of the rules of the committee.

I know that is the established practice and custom of this committee and, as far as I am concerned, it always shall be. I wish to say again that I hope this committee will never knowingly or willingly get into an attitude of mind where we feel that a man is subversive merely because of association or merely because of the name of some member of his family.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I ask this distinguished professor a question?

Dr. LEVINSON. May I answer your remark?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Dr. LEVINSON. May I say about your remark first—

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Dr. LEVINSON. I am sure, as Members of the Congress of the United States, you certainly don't want to harm any innocent individual.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Dr. LEVINSON. I know that, but what I am saying is, nevertheless, the mention of the name of such a young man here does, unfortunately, do him a great deal of harm.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, too, regardless of what Mr. Browder was or what he is, the record speaks very loudly of the fact that the Communist conspiracy, the world conspiracy, got rid of him in May 1945, because he radically differed with the international Communist conspiracy. In other words, he stood forthright at that time the fact an American, free, competitive-enterprise system could and should survive.

Now, may I ask the professor this question: In view of the fact you give evidence of having thought through some of the problems facing your own country, in connection with subversive activities—as you know, under Public Law 601, under which this committee functions, passed in 1946, this committee is challenged with the obligation of recommending to Congress matters of legislative policy in the field of subversive or un-American activities—have you any suggestion to make to us in the field of legislation?

In other words, the main purport of all these hearings that this committee has, in my estimation, is to make the Congress better qualified to intelligently legislate in this field. Have you any suggestions for us?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; I do, Mr. Doyle.

I have a great deal of confidence in human beings. I am very glad to see that the Communist Party has shrunk the way it has. I hope that it shrinks still further. I think that perhaps this shrinkage should be encouraged still more.

I think perhaps some kind of amnesty ruling of some kind could be set up as a law, where members of the Communist Party might be asked to leave the party and perhaps be assured complete privacy to go to some agency of the Government and to indicate that they are leaving, to be guaranteed that the statement they make will be kept in absolute confidence, that they will not be pressed for any further information, that they may be asked but they certainly won't be pressed, and by registering in that way and indicating that they are leaving, that they will then be regarded as being free from the taint of communism.

I think some way of trying to encourage, maybe, the people on the fence, who are still in the party, who have long years of association in it, who have friends in it, but who may begin to be realizing the kind of terrible organization that they're in—I think if they could be encouraged somehow, given a period, let's say—let's say from June 1, 1953, to December 1, 1954—give them some period in which they could get out without in any way being damned, without in any way being exposed, but indicating somehow, in some confidential way, to some agency in the Department of Justice, or otherwise, that they have done so—I think that may encourage some people to leave.

I think people should be encouraged to leave and should be made to feel, to be guaranteed somehow by law, that they wouldn't be damned for what they've done, or won't be exposed, but that the whole thing will be forgiven and forgotten—we will be glad to welcome them back as loyal Americans.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, following that question, Mr. Chairman, may I ask this: When you say not pressurized to do anything, as I take it, except to register that they have withdrawn from the Communist Party, wouldn't you feel it was in the interests of our national security, however, in case some such thing was done, that they be cordially asked and very emphatically and clearly asked to help the Government, through whatever agency they do make this declaration, to reveal the activities of the Communist conspiracy but, nevertheless, to ask them to cooperate to the maximum in the field of subversive activities in this country?

We are not only interested in the 1, 2, 10 percent that register; we are interested in uncovering the subversive conspiracy.

Now, I am asking you there—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. You get my point?

Dr. LEVINSON. I understand your question, and what I would say there is that I think it is very important initially not to stress that feature, and not to—certainly not to require them—they certainly can be asked—anybody can be asked—but to make these people feel they will not be forced or pressed—I think once they reestablish themselves in the normal community, get out of the Communist Party—I think with the passing of time they will begin to realize the sort of hideous organization they have been in, and I think, with the passing of time, many of them will come around to this point of view.

But I think in making the initial step there should be only this one step that they are asked to make, and I have—I have confidence that later on most of them will decide they want to go further.

You see, it's a rather hard thing to get out of an organization like that. People have made long-standing friendships in there, and they have these loyalties. They have a certain number of years—a certain number of years of them is invested in it—and I think they have to be encouraged to leave, and I think no obstacle should be put in the way of their leaving, no obstacles whatever should be put in the way of their leaving.

I think once they do leave, as I say, and retain their health, is the way I put it, by rejoining the general American community—I think as the months or, in some cases, perhaps the years go by they will come around to the point of view that perhaps they should reveal the names of some of their associates, perhaps they should see these associates and try to bring them around to their point of view, to sell them on the fact that they are in the wrong organization.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

I think counsel has a number of questions to obtain facts—

Mr. KUNZIG. We have.

Mr. VELDE. Which should be enlightening.

Mr. KUNZIG. We have a few more, Mr. Chairman.

Professor Levinson, in 1944 there appeared in the New York Times a paid advertisement, headed by the Times, "A Political Advertisement." It was an open letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in behalf of Morris Schappes—S-c-h-a-p-p-e-s. Schappes had been a school-

teacher who was convicted of perjury growing out of his appearance in connection with the Rensselaer investigations there in New York. Among the signers was Prof. Norman Levinson. I take it you signed this advertisement?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't remember the particular one, but it is certainly quite likely that I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. I will pass it over to you, marked "Levinson Exhibit No. 4"—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). For identification.

I am interested in finding out—and I know the committee would be interested in knowing, Professor—whether the Communist Party of Massachusetts played any part in soliciting your signature or in backing this action.

Dr. LEVINSON. As I remember, I signed a large number of these things. I don't know if the committee by any means has all of them, although they certainly seem to have given me quite a few.

I belonged to a large number of organizations of this sort, or signed a large number of statements.

As I remember, the usual thing would be that I would get a letter from the New York headquarters.

Here it is listed as Schappes Defense Committee.

The usual thing would be I would get a letter and the statement. If I subscribed to the statement at that time, I would sign it.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Well, now in this type of thing in which we are beginning to develop, you can see here a certain type of paper, letter, or document that you very frequently apparently signed.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was the Communist Party involved in that sort of thing?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, in the case—the only committee that I remember now definitely was the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder; and, as I remember there, the Communist Party of Massachusetts was involved. In these other things they apparently originated from New York, and I have no firsthand knowledge. My suspicion would be that they were involved. I have no actual information.

Mr. KUNZIG. But from your experiences as a Communist during some 8 years that you were a Communist, your suspicion today would be that they were involved?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; it is rather typical Communist activity.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, in 1946 another organization was formed for the purpose of abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities. This organization was known as the Citizens United To Abolish the Wood-Rankin Committee. This committee purchased a full-page advertisement in the New York Times, which advertisement contained the names of "just a few of the outstanding Americans who were supporting the fight." Among the names again was Norman Levinson.

I will pass this document over to you, marked "Levinson exhibit No. 5," for identification, and see if you recognize that and whether you are the Professor Levinson who signed it.

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't remember this particular document, but it's quite—I would say it's quite likely I was a signer.

I see that it involved opposition to Mr. Rankin. I must say I don't agree with Mr. Rankin in general. I wouldn't join—I wouldn't join today with any Communist group in opposing him, but it might very well be through some other group I might oppose him.

Mr. KUNZIG. This is talking, sir, about the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Would you say that this, as you have said already today, document was undoubtedly inspired by the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I suspect it was. On the other hand, I don't—my personal feeling is I wouldn't regard Congressman Rankin as a very fair man.

That—that's my personal opinion. You gentlemen may, of course, disagree with me.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, you said, Doctor, you had read the testimony of Granville Hicks before this committee.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever read the testimony of Dr. Bella Dodd before the Jenner committee of the Senate?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; I did not. Some of my colleagues have talked to me about it, and they say they found it very impressive, in particular the story she told of the personal involvement, the personal loyalties, and so on, that she formed in the Communist Party and the difficulty she had as an individual in breaking—in breaking these ties.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, the chairman and I went over to listen to her testimony before that committee and we were very much impressed. If I recall correctly her testimony with reference to having individuals like yourself, as she called them, intellectuals, sign such petitions, resolutions, and other documents, it was to the effect that whenever the Communist Party wanted to promote a cause or, as she put it, smear somebody in political life or get rid of them in the educational field because they opposed the Communist theory, these documents, she testified, were prepared in party headquarters—that is, either the petitions, the resolutions or the telegrams. Then they had a list in party headquarters of some thousand intellectuals—educators, ministers, and so forth, all over the country. They would either telegraph them or write them and ask them to sign those petitions; and she pointed out many times the persons in party headquarters who prepared these telegrams and resolutions for these thousand intellectuals to sign had, in many cases, not even high-school educations.

Could it be that you were on that list and asked to sign these petitions and resolutions from time to time?

Mr. LEVINSON. I would strongly suspect in that period if any—if there was such a list—and I am sure if she says so there probably was—that I was on it.

Mr. SCHERER. It would indicate, then, perhaps some of these resolutions and petitions that you signed were those that were prepared in some headquarters of the Communist Party, as Dr. Bella Dodd explained to us?

Dr. LEVINSON. That's right; it may well be.

Incidentally, there were many I didn't sign. I would read them before I signed them; and if I signed them, it meant at that time I was more or less in agreement with what they said.

MR. KUNZIG. Wouldn't it be correct to say, then, Professor Levinson, looking back over the period from 1937 to 1945, in which you were a member of the party, that your signing these various documents or statements or protests, or whatever they may have been, was in almost all cases, if not all cases, following the Communist line at that period?

DR. LEVINSON. Yes; I think—I think in most cases they were. Where I didn't follow the Communist line—of course, that didn't occur until fairly late—let's say in the beginning—maybe it went to 1943 or 1944—I had some differences with Browder, and within the New Masses—where I didn't follow them, it would only be by not signing certain things.

MR. KUNZIG. Well, I am interested in asking, then—and I don't mean this in any way suggestive as opposite to your present position and what you have already testified—could it be—and I am asking this as a hypothetical question—that the Communist line today is that there are very few Communists, that it is unimportant, that there is no threat, that it is silly to worry and bother?

Could that be the Communist line in 1953?

DR. LEVINSON. I don't really know.

I think—I think that perhaps you are attributing a too high degree of intelligence to the Communist leadership by suggesting such a line. They are certainly never subtle, as far as I can see. If they begin to adopt subtle policies, it would be an indication of marked change in their intelligence level.

MR. SCHERER. Of course, you recall the testimony just a few weeks ago of J. Edgar Hoover before an appropriations committee of Congress in which he said that the menace is greater today than at any time in our history.

DR. LEVINSON. Because of the underground aspect.

MR. SCHERER. Because of the underground aspect.

DR. LEVINSON. Yes; I agree. I think there is no question this group has to be under surveillance and watched, because otherwise they will infiltrate the sensitive parts of the Government. There is no question about that.

MR. SCHERER. What we have left today is the hard core—would you say that—of the party?

DR. LEVINSON. Well, it is certainly getting harder all the time.

MR. SCHERER. Well, you said anybody that remains needs psychiatric care today?

DR. LEVINSON. Yes, sir; I feel that way.

MR. SCHERER. Then they would be psychopaths of some kind?

DR. LEVINSON. Well, I don't know if you would call them psychopaths. Certainly I would say they are neurotic and rather maladjusted persons.

MR. SCHERER. The same type as Hitler and Mussolini perhaps?

DR. LEVINSON. Well, there is all—there is quite a spectrum of neurotics and maladjusted people, but I think it would include sadistic people and masochistic people.

MR. SCHERER. Well, the fact their numbers are small doesn't lessen the danger of the country at this time. It might increase the danger because there are those types of individuals?

DR. LEVINSON. Yes; the danger is great as far as their—their working under cover, trying to infiltrate the Government. As long as

they're working in democratic organizations of any kind, in town meetings, or any kind of real American organization, I think that they don't have a chance.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then every time one of these undercover people is exposed in that fashion we are lessening the danger to some degree; is that correct?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I at that point ask him one question?

Mr. VELDE. Would you let the witness answer—

Mr. DOYLE. If I could ask this one right there, I think it is very pertinent.

Mr. VELDE. All right.

Mr. DOYLE. When you say as long as they work in democratic processes, and so forth, they don't stand much chance, how do you explain the fact that they were doing that in 1938 and 1939 and 1940 and they succeeded in getting a group of you wonderfully educated American professors in their ranks?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, they didn't—

Mr. DOYLE. What was it—

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. What was it they did to get you men to join a secret organization?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes. Well, in the first place, of course, that was about—I joined about 16 years ago. I was a rather young man, to say the least. I think the soil in which they had to work was rather different. As I say, there was this terrible depression, unemployment. We were destroying crops. Our factories were shut down. It was an absolutely different situation. Here we were, the richest country in the world—and yet we weren't functioning economically; and I think this was a good soil for Communists to work in.

I think it's also true that they didn't get the people who joined the party at that time to subscribe to any—any vile act. The Communist Party constitution at that time under—that was part of the Browder period—was a document which subscribed to, on the whole, rather American ideals. People who were simply Communist Party members ordinarily would not be aware of the fact that most of the leadership of the Communist Party was simply Moscow puppets. They wouldn't know—

Mr. DOYLE. When did you discover that?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, I began to discover that fairly early. Then I began to distinguish between various kinds of leaders. I discovered it—I think my first contact with that was in the early 1940's.

Mr. SCHIERER. Wasn't it a fact that many joined the party in the late thirties because they felt that the Communist Party at that time was opposed to anti-Semitism?

Dr. LEVINSON. That was a feature. In my case, the main thing was that I came to the conclusion—as I see it now, it was not a valid conclusion—as a result of the depression that capitalism wouldn't function any more, that what we needed was socialism.

That was the basic—the basic drive as far as my joining the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHIERER. You would say, though, today, from what you know and from what you have read, that the Communist Party today is violently anti-Semitic?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, from what I read—well, this story of these doctors, of course, is—it is a fantastic story. Now they are on it and now they are off.

It is quite clear the Communists will play with people like puppets; and if it suits their purposes to persecute the Jews, they certainly do so. There is no question about that. They have no regard for the human being.

Mr. SCHERER. Perhaps they are doing that now to gain favor with the Arabs?

Dr. LEVINSON. It may well be. There seems to be some kind—the switch is certainly hard to tell. Certainly the trials—

Mr. SCHERER. Maybe they are interested in the Arabian oil?

Dr. LEVINSON. I should think they would be. In the trials in Czechoslovakia—in the trials that occurred in Czechoslovakia, it is quite clear there was a strong tone of anti-Semitism. This is quite obvious. There is no question about it.

Mr. VELDE. I think we are getting a little bit—

Mr. SCHERER. Far afield.

Mr. VELDE. Far afield, in speculation.

Counsel had a question. Could you rephrase your question?

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Professor, you said very emphatically the danger today was the hard core of underground members of the Communist Party in America. Isn't it true, then, that every Communist who is exposed, who is brought to the light of the American people, is lessening that danger? In other words, that helps America?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; I would agree, with one very important qualification—that it's very important to make sure that it's a real Communist that is being exposed.

The naming of men, of innocent men, of men who have long left the Communist Party or who have never been Communist Party members—I think that is a terrible thing.

I think any harm to nonguilty people, no matter how desirable it is to catch the guilty people, should be avoided. I think—I think that is the American way—not to hurt the innocent.

I think every effort should be made, in exposing the guilty, to avoid doing any damage whatsoever to people who were never Communists, or there may be speculation about them but no real evidence, or people who have left the Communist Party, and so on. I think that is a very important thing.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, agreeing with you, there is no damage—let's get right back to the main point, you do agree that exposing Communists today, in 1953, is an important thing for the American people?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, exposing them or at least making sure the FBI knows about them.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Professor Levinson, I just want to go back a little bit to where we were a few moments ago. You were a member of the board or at least a trustee of the Samuel Adams School in Boston; is that right?

Dr. LEVINSON. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain to the committee your understanding of this organization—the Samuel Adams School—its purposes and objectives?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Oh, I have no doubt that this school was—I mean, as I see it now, as I look back on the whole thing, I have no doubt that this school was properly brought into existence as a result of a Communist decision that they should have schools, in various cities of the United States.

I think that the [Samuel] Adams School—I don't think that the Communist Party had had enough forces. I was not a member of the Communist Party most of the time. I was on the board of the [Samuel] Adams School—

Mr. KUNZIG. Let us get those dates. You said that you were no longer a member of the Communist Party after the summer of 1945.

Dr. LEVINSON. That is my best recollection.

Mr. KUNZIG. When were you connected with the Samuel Adams School? It was later, wasn't it?

Dr. LEVINSON. It was later. My recollection would be 1946 to 1948, but I don't remember exactly.

Mr. KUNZIG. So you were active in the Samuel Adams School after the period of time that you were no longer a Communist?

Dr. LEVINSON. I wouldn't say active. I was a member of the board of trustees with which group I met 3 or 4 times a year for 2 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could it be that the Communist Party and the people who controlled it and the Samuel Adams School didn't know then that you were, at least mentally in your own mind, not a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. LEVINSON. I think that I had some rather strong disputes with some of the officials of the Communist Party because of the review that appeared in the New Masses, and we were in Marxist disagreement. The Communist Party was very interested in this school and was very interested in some of the groups in the school, but the school was in some respects not 100 percent in their hands. They did not have enough people to put into it. They did want to have contact with other elements of the community other than strict Communists.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Herbert Philbrick?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't believe I ever met him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Philbrick testified that the Communist Party passed on the qualifications of the individuals assigned to instruct or lecture in specific classes and courses. Do you know whether that is a fact?

Dr. LEVINSON. As a member of the board of trustees I would doubt that very much. I know some of the people who taught there were miles away from the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. You are not suggesting, are you, that the Communist Party had no interest in the Samuel Adams School?

Dr. LEVINSON. I am not suggesting that at all. The Communist Party was very interested. I am sure they sent a number of their best workers there and I am sure that several of the courses given in the school on Marxist doctrines were very closely watched by the Communists, but there were a number of general adult education classes that the board of trustees handled on their own.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Philbrick further testified that many of the courses taught at the school were selected and planned directly by the Communist Party and that many of the folders and pamphlets for the Samuel Adams School were prepared by the Communist Party. Would you know that of your own knowledge?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Communist Party members or any of your Communist acquaintances solicit you to participate in the affairs of the Samuel Adams School?

Dr. LEVINSON. No. Well, I was simply invited. There was some kind of a social afternoon or evening in the home of somebody at Beacon Hill and I don't recall everybody who was there. I believe a man from the Jefferson School [of Social Science] in New York came to tell how the Jefferson School [of Social Science] was operating, and a large number of people from Boston were invited, a considerable number of them not Communists and who were interested in the school in that way.

Mr. KUNZIG. Hasn't it always been the practice of the Communist Party to have a considerable number of people who are not Communists but who are leftists, liberals, let us say, mingle with the group to give it a larger total volume, but keeping the control with the Communists?

Dr. LEVINSON. I think that is certainly a definite Communist characteristic; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you have any knowledge of an organization known by the name of the Henry Thoreau Group?

Dr. LEVINSON. I believe that that group consisted of various people from MIT and Harvard who went under that name.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of that group?

Mr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of the Cambridge branch of the American Association of Scientific Workers?

Dr. LEVINSON. In the very early years I was. I think later I became sort of a dues-paying member and never went to the meetings and then I dropped out.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know whether the American Association of Scientific Workers was a part of the World Federation of Scientific Workers?

Dr. LEVINSON. I don't know.

Mr. KUNZIG. The committee's information indicates that the World Federation of Scientific Workers was an international and scientific organization under almost completed domination and control of the Communist Party throughout the world. Do you have any knowledge on that fact?

Dr. LEVINSON. No, I do not.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make reference again to this statement regarding Felix Browder.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Very briefly, your testimony and in my opinion what has transpired before the committee today has been helpful to it and I am in complete accord with the statement made by my colleague, Mr. Scherer, the gentleman from Ohio. Wouldn't you agree with that, that in view of the handicap you already had regarding his name and what you have testified to here today has been helpful to him instead of being harmful.

Dr. LEVINSON. Since his name was brought up as to whether he was a member of the Communist Party, and so far as I know there was no ground for asking that question and I think what is happening today was essential in clearing him.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Dr. LEVINSON. We don't get young fellows like that in enough numbers. Hitler helped us in connection with physicists and mathematicians, but I think if we have a fellow like that we should do everything possible to encourage him to do scientific work to build American science.

Mr. SCHERER. On the basis of what you have already said about Felix Browder, I accept it and certainly that would be the attitude of this committee.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes, I realize that as long as the committee knew the truth in this matter they would certainly react this way.

Mr. KUNZIG. You requested the opportunity to talk to us and discuss the point before this hearing and we gave you that opportunity.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes, I want to thank you very much for that opportunity.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer, do you have a question?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the professor's statement about setting up some plans whereby former Communists could more actively cooperate with the committee and in view of the fact that our chairman at this session and also our chairman during the last session, our committee at the last session of Congress and our committee at this session of Congress has a standing invitation to any persons in America to come forward to this committee in executive session, if you please, professor and without their names being known and give the committee the benefit of their experience. We ought to again have the record show this morning and have it thoroughly understood by this group of MIT professors who are here helping us that there is that standing invitation and it has been standing for years and it has not been standing with moss on it either. We have urged it very frequently through the press and through the radio and every other way. I thought I would make that emphasis again. It is a standing invitation to people who have been Communists and wanted to help their Government in defense against the international conspiracy; to come to us and to our legislative staff off the record and get the utmost of cooperation from us.

To me it just seems that a person, especially on the level of education that you fine men have, college professors, teachers, doctors, lawyers, and preachers—when they come to the point that they recognize their duty to their country to come to some agency of Government and disclose their former Communist membership, with God's help or somebody's help, ought to get to the point and mental attitude where they also recognize that their fullest duty to their country at that time is to disclose the activities of Communist conspiracies and how they operate. I mean to cooperate in giving information which will help Government clean up the conspiracy. I hope that as you go back home you men will emphasize that and take that step also.

Mr. RAND. Could counsel say something on that without being impertinent?

Mr. VELDE. Proceed. It is the usual rule that counsel is allowed to advise with his witness and not make statements, but you may proceed.

Mr. RAND. I would be glad to say it to the committee or before an executive session. I have been here with three men from MIT. I hope that the committee feels that they have heard three conscientious people who have had a distinct change of heart and, though it has been a difficult thing, have been glad to come here. I am sure from my discussion with these men that had they thoroughly understood at the outset that they could come before this committee and tell the names of the friends and be sure that they would be kept in confidence that they would be given an opportunity to tell which friends they were going to name and they would have been glad to come down and talk to the committee privately and under conditions which are less tense than they have up here in this public hearing.

You did see yesterday that Professor Martin was quite nervous. He doesn't face this sort of thing easily. I certainly believe that if it could be announced that some of these people who have been through this unfortunate experience could know that they could come to the committee in executive session and talk as between friends and confidentially with the understanding that the names that they had wouldn't be made public until the people had been investigated and perhaps given an opportunity to come before the committee themselves in executive session, that these men would have been down here long ago.

As you probably realize, it is difficult for a conscientious man to name his friends in this thing. The really courageous fellow is perfectly willing to talk about his own Communist activities. All three of these men, when I started to talk about it, were more than willing to come and tell privately or publicly what their entire connection was with the Communist Party, but they had the same feeling that I certainly have ingrained in myself—that I was brought up not to tell tales, even on my older brother, and none of us like to do it.

I asked Professor Levinson when the question was put, I think by Mr. Doyle, as to some suggestion as to how to do things easier, "Have you got an answer?" I don't have an answer. He told me that he did not have an answer, and to me that is a very sound answer.

Mr. VELDE. Thank you for the assistance that you have been giving, not only to your client but also to the committee.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Levinson, in clearing up the record after the discussion with the Congressman just a moment ago, until you were subpœnaed by this committee, did you ever give any of the information you have given here publicly today to any other Government agency?

Dr. LEVINSON. No; I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. So that what you have said here today, the testimony before the committee and before the public is the first time you have ever given this information?

Dr. LEVINSON. To any Government agency?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Dr. LEVINSON. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. I mean this in no disrespectful way at all, but a number of members of the Communist Party who have been dissatisfied with the party and who have seen fit to withdraw from the party have gone to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and given their information to a legally constituted body of our American Government. I am just

wondering if you ever had that in mind yourself at the time you were on the verge, shall we say, of getting out of the party?

Dr. LEVINSON. Certainly at the time I was on the verge of getting out of the party I would never have considered such a thing, and that is why I made the proposal I made before of some way of a man going to some branch of Government and stating his own case. When a man is getting out of the party it is very hard for him to think in terms of exposing his associates. He is willing to tell about himself. If he could do that and not be pushed beyond the point, I think that would be the case. So far as the Federal Bureau of Investigation is concerned, on the basis of the questions that were asked, it has always been clear that the Federal Bureau of Investigation not only knew about me but there was every evidence that they knew everybody who had been associated with the Henry Thoreau and other groups. They seemed to have pretty good knowledge of the whole thing. I doubt if I have anything to add to what they also know.

Mr. VELDE. I was in the Federal Bureau of Investigation for some time and I am aware of the fact that while every attempt is made to discover subversive activities by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, like all other intelligence agencies they are not infallible, and I can assure you very definitely that the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not have the complete roster of members of the Communist Party and does not have a complete list of all of the persons in this country who are engaged in subversive activities. That fact has been brought out. I think Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are fine people and it is a great organization, but they are not infallible.

So as a committee of Congress, elected by the people, we feel that we have a duty and that duty has been imposed upon us by Congress not only to report to Congress for the purpose of remedial legislation but to inform the people who elected us about subversive activities. Frankly, I think that at the time you became dissatisfied and withdrew from the Communist Party, as an American citizen it imposed a duty upon you to apply to some agency of government which was interested in subversive activities. You say you knew they were investigating you. I mean that in all respect, but I just want to put that in the record.

Do you have any further questions?

Mr. DOYLE. I have one which I believe is important. I was in attendance at another committee meeting so I didn't hear the preliminary statement of this witness this morning, so I do not have the benefit of that information. May I ask you this; am I correct or am I in error that there are a number of American citizens who joined the Communist Party in 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942 who stayed until and even are now, some of them, members, but in that group of American citizens were those who were interested in the Communist Party on an intellectual basis really philosophically to study Marxism and to see if that was a way out of the dilemma which they thought existed in our country? Is there a difference at this time within that group of the men who still stayed in although joining back there, after the Duclos letter of May 1945, who still stayed in and those who would get out if they thought that there was a way they could, either by

going to the Federal Bureau of Investigation or by coming to this committee? Do you get my point?

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Is the group who stays in now, men of your intelligence or intellectual background or a little less than yours, who still stay in because they want to stay in and are still confirmed Communists and some other group also who want to get out but haven't seen the light?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well I certainly don't know who is in the Communist Party these days. I would suspect actually that practically no academic people are left in. As I said before, I think only very maladjusted people could remain in the Communist Party in view of what has transpired since the war, the terrible destruction of democracy in Czechoslovakia was a ghastly thing. The obvious non-existence of any kind of civil liberties in the Soviet Union and so on.

Mr. DOYLE. My closing question is, I understand the purport of your answer is that those who do stay in now since the close of the war and since the Duclous letter of May 1945 are men and women who basically wished to further the international Communist conspiracy as written about by Marx and others.

Dr. LEVINSON. Yes; they certainly wish to further that conspiracy. I would hesitate to blame it all on Marx. There was an awful lot added that Marx would be disturbed and distressed about. They certainly wish to further that conspiracy. There is no question about that.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. Dr. Levinson, I think I can speak for the committee in saying that we feel that you and your counsel have performed a patriotic service in coming before this committee and giving us the benefit of your knowledge relative to subversive activities and other activities which are going on at the present time in this country.

Unless there is anything further, you are discharged from your subpoena with the committee's thanks.

The committee will stand in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

(Thereupon, at 12:22 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 p. m., same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 2:30 p. m., of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy (appearance noted in transcript), Gordon H. Scherer, and Clyde Doyle.)

Mr. VELDE. Let the record show that I have appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Doyle of California and myself as chairman for the purpose of this hearing. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will Mrs. Theodora Goldstein come forward, please?

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. THEODORA GOLDSTEIN, ACCCOMPANIED BY
HER COUNSEL, LAWRENCE D. SHUBOW

Mr. TAVENNER. State your name, please.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Theodora Goldstein.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. SHUBOW. Lawrence D. Shubow, 10 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spell your name S-h-u-b-o-w?

Mr. SHUBOW. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mrs. Goldstein, are you not?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your name before marriage?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Mitzberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that, please?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. M-i-t-z-b-e-r-g.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the place of your birth?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your first name?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Theodora.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you also known among your friends as Teddy?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am known by my friends as Teddy.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am employed as a secretary in Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sorry, I didn't hear you.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I said I am employed as a secretary in Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you employed there?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. How?

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. By an attorney by the name of A. R.—

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not interested in the name, just the nature of the work.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I work for an attorney in Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you worked in that capacity?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I started as a part-time employee in December 1951 and sometime in January 1952 I started full-time employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I graduated from Wattley High School in New York City in 1934. In 1938 I was graduated from Hunter College. I took some graduate courses in chemistry at Columbia University extension from 1938 to 1939. That is the extent of my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment has been since the completion of your formal educational training in 1939?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1938.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes, because I worked as a full-time volunteer for 1938 and 1939 at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and from 1939 to 1941 I was employed by New York University Medical School at Bellevue Hospital in New York City. I worked there until 1941

because my husband was in service and I stopped working so that I could travel with him. When he went overseas in 1941 with the Marine Corps, I went back to New York and worked from 1942 to 1943 at the New York University Medical School. From about October 1943 to June 1944, when my husband came back from overseas, I stopped working and I had been working for Kellex Corp.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that Kellex, please?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. K-e-l-l-e-x Corp. Then from 1944 to 1945 I didn't work because again I was traveling with my husband when he was stationed in California. In 1945 I worked for Shell Oil Development Co. in Emeryville, Calif. I worked until we came back east. We came to Boston. I didn't work for a short period and then I was employed by a charitable organization. During the year 1946, during part of 1946 and from 1946 the fall until early in 1949 I worked for several political action organizations. From 1949—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment, political action organizations. What do you mean?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. They were organizations for which I am very proud to have worked. They were concerned about the passage of legislation, specific legislation against discrimination for housing, increased appropriations for schools.

(At this point Representative Gordon H. Scherer entered the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did I understand that was between 1946 and 1949?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes, sir; and for the election of candidates whom we believed it would be good to have in office.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were those organizations?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Mr. Tavenner, the organizations with which I have worked and for which I have worked, some of the organizations this committee has put on its blacklist without notice or without hearing and I am not going to—I decline.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean that the committee has listed them as being either Communist or subversive or Communist-front organizations?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Well, this committee has listed them and what I assume it means is that this committee does not approve of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is not a matter of approval or disapproval. It is a matter of classifying certain organizations because of their activities, such as the Attorney General of the United States has done. They are not blacklisting. They are designating the organizations for certain activities.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. But they are designated without the organization having a chance of hearings of any respect of the organization to present its position and without a chance to defend itself against being so designated.

Mr. TAVENNER. What organization has been so designated by the Attorney General or this committee for which you worked in a secretarial or executive capacity?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am sorry, sir. I said that I decline to give you the names of those organizations because they have been listed and because my answers might conceivably do me damage and I proclaim the right of the fifth amendment in not giving you those names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you work at any time as an assistant for a non-Communist who in turn was active in the Progressive Citizens of America?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. That seems to me to be several questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, it is one question.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am going to decline to answer that. You are asking about where I have worked and I have said that I decline to give you that, and you are asking about people with whom I worked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want you to be misled by my question. The Progressive Citizens of America has not been cited as a Communist-front organization, to my knowledge, either by the Attorney General of the United States or this committee.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I must admit that I am not thoroughly familiar with the total list of organizations designated by this committee or by the Attorney General. I know the names of some of them and I know that they grow constantly without the public being given any, you know, adequate information and I am not going to, because some of these have been listed—I am not going to give you—I don't feel that I would be doing myself a—

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking you about a specific organization which has not been so listed.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. May I consult counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Counsel advised me firstly of one fact which I had forgotten, and that is that this organization about which you asked has been listed in my own State as such a subversive organization.

Mr. SCHERER. What State is that?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Massachusetts, and also without notice or hearing. It was arbitrary.

Mr. SCHERER. By whom was it designated?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. A committee of the Massachusetts State Legislature, and also it has been accused publicly and I don't know whether the accusations were made before this committee, but it was made by witnesses before this committee of having been infiltrated by Communists and subversives and I think—well, with that background as a reason I have a reasonable assumption on which I can claim the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will recall, my question was whether or not you worked as an assistant or as a secretary to a person who was a non-Communist. I am not asking you about working for a Communist who was engaged or might have been engaged in work for the Progressive Citizens of America. I am asking you specifically if you worked for a person who was not a Communist.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Well, firstly I worked for many people and I do not ask their political affiliations when I work for them or with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean to say you don't know and—

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. No, I didn't say I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. And because of your uncertainty about that, you felt that you should not be requested to answer the question?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. No, I feel I should not be required to answer because I do not feel that I should be asked about the political affiliations of people with whom I worked, and I decline to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. He didn't ask about the political affiliation, did you, Mr. Tavenner? Wasn't the question whether she worked for a man?

Mr. TAVENNER. That was all.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. You asked whether I worked for a person who is a non-Communist, which is again the political affiliation.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you have that man's name, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. Mrs. Goldstein, a witness by the name of Herbert A. Philbrick testified before this committee on July 23, 1951, regarding his membership in a professional group of the Communist Party in Boston, Mass. He advised the committee that he became a member of the Communist Party in 1944 and continued as a member until he was expelled from the Communist Party in April of 1951, I think. During that period of time he was acting in behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in obtaining information for the Government regarding the operations of the Communist Party in Boston. This is his testimony with regard to a professional cell of the Communist Party.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. May I interrupt you, sir. If this is the same information which appeared in one part of Mr. Philbrick's \$2 million accusations in the form of a book, I have read them, I have read parts of his book.

(At this point Representative Kit Clardy entered the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Suppose you listen to my statement and then I will base a question on it. Mr. Philbrick was asked to describe the circumstances under which he became a member of this professional group of the Communist Party and this was his testimony before this committee:

Mr. PHILBRICK. I joined the pro group upon orders of Fanny Hartman, and was instructed at that time that I was to separate myself from the Eighth Congressional District work and from affiliation with groups in that section, and join an underground Communist group known only as Pro-4, or sometimes known as MO.

Mr. Philbrick continued to testify as follows:

I was instructed at the time that I was to drop all contact with all members of the Communist Party with whom I had been previously affiliated. I was to drop out of sight and no longer affiliate with them or fraternize with them on an official or a social basis. So far as the comrades with whom I had been previously affiliated, I had apparently dropped out of the Communist Party.

I was told that in the pro group I was to affiliate only with members in my own cell, and that I was to keep the identities of known people in my cell a secret; that is, I was not to mention their names to any other individuals, either that I knew them as Communists or as non-Communists.

And so in either September or October 1947 I did separate myself from the Eighth Congressional District and joined the pro group.

Mr. Philbrick was asked then to state to the committee what the general purposes of this group were. He testified as follows:

Mr. PHILBRICK. First of all, all of these people were professional people. They were engaged in the law profession, or the teaching profession, or advertising, or as doctors, or in some other line of work of a professional nature.

Their chief objectives were twofold. Number one, of course, was to serve as Communist Party agents in Communist-front organizations. By Communist-front organizations I mean those such as the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. At least two members of my own cell were assigned to work in that group.

Then we were also instructed to participate in non-Communist organizations. At that time, for example, the Progressive Citizens of America might be considered as a non-Communist organization to some extent. I believe members of

the professional group worked in the forerunner of the Progressive Citizens of America, known as the Citizens PAC, was it not, Citizens Political Action Committee?

And of course we were asked to influence people in our normal surroundings. For example, I was listed as a Republican in Melrose, and listed as a Baptist, and I was to influence these people as best I could in Marxism.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you directed by the Communist Party to become a member of the Republican Party, or were you a member of the Republican Party and used your membership at the instance of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was requested to be a member of the Republican Party by the Communists. From my history, which they had a very record of, they knew that my parents were both Republicans so they said, "We think it is a good idea for you to be listed as a Republican, too, especially since the Democrats are very weak in your town and the Republicans are the only ones that have any force there."

Mr. JACKSON. Did you make any converts among the Republicans?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I am afraid not.

Then Mr. Philbrick was asked to advise the committee the number of people in this professional group which he had identified and he stated that there were between 70 and 80 members and that they were divided into smaller groups, 14 or 15.

Mr. Philbrick then proceeded to advise the committee that in the particular cell that he was assigned to there were 12 members and he was asked to give the names of those persons. This is his reply:

At the time I joined, the chairman was a person named Dick. Immediately thereafter, Comrade Martha became leader of the cell.

He advised the committee he was known in the group himself by the name of Herb. He said there was a person by the name of Comrade Jackie, who happened to be a girl. Comrade Norma, Teddy, who was also a girl. Faith. And Henry. He advised the committee that they were known by the first names in this group and during the period of his experience with them he was able to learn their last names, the last names of some of them but not all of them.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick then advised that different members of this group were assigned to various organizations.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. He said this:

Comrade Jackie was a girl, a stenographer or a private secretary. Her assignment by the party for quite a while was that of working with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

He said that Comrade Norma was also assigned to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

He referred to Comrade Helen and said:

Comrade Helen, I learned her last name was something like Dugochet. I don't know how that was spelled. The phonetic spelling would be D-u-g-o-c-h-e-t. I believe she was a British citizen and served as a courier for the party, making many trips between here and Great Britain.

He said:

Comrade Teddy was assigned to the Progressive Party. I don't recall her name at the moment, but she played an important part in the Progressive Party work in Massachusetts.

You referred to a book which was subsequently written by Mr. Philbrick. It is entitled "I Led 3 Lives: Citizen-Communist-Counter-spy."

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The book was copyrighted in 1952. He elaborates somewhat in his book upon the testimony which I have just read to you.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. He described in detail in this book how he attended the first meeting of this professional cell of which he was a member and how he was met at the door by a person named Norma in whose home they met, and that that home was on Revere Street Hill, a few feet from the corner of Revere and Charles, apartment No. 6.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. He described in this book how he entered the room and upon entering was introduced by Norma to those who were present and this is the language in which he describes the introduction:

Now meet these other people. Teddy, Jackie, Faith, Butch, Peg, Helen—this is Herb.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And then he continued:

There was only one among them whom I knew well, Comrade Teddy, a pert, pretty career girl, was an executive assistant—

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read):

executive assistant to one of the leading non-Communist figures in PCA. In this position she was a veritable pipeline of information from the top level of PCA to the Communist Party. She had access to PCA plans, platforms, and decisions even before the membership.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read):

She knew thoroughly the organization's sources of income and political contacts. Now she greeted me with a superior little smile.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the 'Teddy' referred to by Mr. Philbrick in this testimony as a member of a professional group of the Communist Party in Boston?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Mr. Tavenner, firstly, I am not going to answer that question and there are several reasons why I am not going to answer it. If I could face Mr. Philbrick and have my counsel cross-examine him, that would be fine. Also, it seems to me that to be faced with questions of accusation not of any illegal acts and to be put in a position of having to either acknowledge or disavow and to answer these questions is against everything that involves fair play.

Mr. TAVENNER. If this information is correct and you were a member of that cell, you would be in a position to be of invaluable aid to this committee in the investigation it is undertaking.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Mr. Tavenner, I have no desire of being of invaluable aid to this committee in its investigation. I don't concede the committee's right to investigate political bodies.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not asked you—

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. If you investigated illegal acts I would be happy to.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not asked you regarding your political acts. I am asking you regarding a very important activity.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question? Were you the Teddy referred to in the testimony of Mr. Philbrick?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am not going to answer questions that involve my political affiliation. I won't do it because I don't think under the first amendment—I have a right to have private opinions. I am not guilty of any overt acts of disloyalty or of any overt illegal acts and I am not going to answer that question and it seems to me quite obvious they might conceivably be used against me and I claim protection under the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Did I understand you to say that you would not cooperate with this committee?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. No, I shall not.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you cooperate with it in other investigations?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I can think of—

Mr. CLARDY. I am asking whether you would cooperate with this committee in any other investigation.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Being familiar with the work of this committee, Mr. Clardy, I find it difficult to answer that in a general way. I would have to know what it was investigating.

Mr. CLARDY. You can answer "Yes" or "No" and you wouldn't be very general. I am asking you whether you would cooperate with us in any other investigations?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. It depends on the investigations.

Mr. CLARDY. Suppose we should carry on an investigation and call before us other persons who might in some fashion or other have been identified as having been members of the Communist Party. Would you aid in that investigation if you had information?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. That is the same investigation.

Mr. CLARDY. It is, and you would not then cooperate?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. No, not in an investigation of people's political activities.

Mr. VELDE. Let me get something straight. In answer to Mr. Tavenner's question relative to your identification as a person named Teddy, you said you would not cooperate with the committee, as I understand it, because it conflicted with your political views.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. That was one of my reasons.

Mr. VELDE. And therefore you decline to answer the question.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes, sir; but that was one of my reasons. I said if that reason itself is not accepted by this committee I will also refuse to answer that question because my answer might conceivably be used against me and I won't, you know, testify against myself. I claim the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of your answers to committee member, Mr. Clardy, in which I understood you to say that whether or not you would cooperate with the committee depended upon the investigation which we were making.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. If we happened to be investigating some person or group of persons whom you believed to be Fascists, would you cooperate with the committee?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Well, I believe for example that—I can think of a specific case. I can answer that by saying that I will help the committee investigate all overt acts or criminal acts or force or violence.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I was thinking specifically of one which my counsel reminded me of and which I think falls into your category, which is the bombing of the home of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Moore in Florida. I would be happy to participate in the investigation to uncover those people responsible.

Mr. DOYLE. I was asking you a specific question.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I will participate in any investigation of criminal acts or of violence.

Mr. DOYLE. My question was whether or not you would cooperate with this committee.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Not in ideas.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you think membership in the Communist Party has something merely to do with politics?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. May I consult counsel?

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, surely, at any time.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. May I hear the question again? You said did I believe that membership in the Communist Party is a political activity?

Mr. CLARDY. Will you you read the question, Mr. Reporter?

(At this point the following question was read :)

Do you think membership in the Communist Party has something merely to do with politics?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I think that until there are overt, illegal acts performed, and I am not aware of any on the part of the Communist Party, that I would answer "Yes" to that question.

Mr. CLARDY. I wasn't asking you anything about overt acts at all. I am merely asking you whether or not you regard membership in the Communist Party as membership in a political party?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes, I do.

Mr. CLARDY. And you do not think then, I take it, that the Communist Party is engaged in any conspiracy either within the Nation or on a worldwide basis?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I think—you asked me my opinion. You asked me a matter of my opinion.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you read the question to her again, Mr. Reporter?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

And you do not think then, I take it, that the Communist Party is engaged in any conspiracy either within the Nation or on a worldwide basis?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. It just struck me when I heard the stenographer reread the question, you haven't said conspiracy about what. I think this is a matter of opinion, but in my opinion it is not.

Mr. CLARDY. In other words, then, you are presently of the belief or the opinion, whichever you care to phrase it, that the Communist Party is not today conspiring against the Nation of which you are a citizen?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. CLARDY. How long have you been of that belief?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I have never—I suppose firstly—

Mr. CLARDY. I am not trying to find your age now; don't misunderstand.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I think you are, however, asking questions that I don't concede the right of this committee to ask. I think you are asking questions that are matters of opinion and I could refuse to answer because I don't have to express my opinions on how long I have held them.

Mr. CLARDY. The committee has a pretty fair knowledge of the law. If you do not care to answer, just to rely upon one of the constitutional provisions, you may do so, but please answer it or decline on the grounds that you stated previously.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I will decline to answer those questions; you know we are delving into my own political opinions.

Mr. CLARDY. Then, to put it another way so there will not be a question of opinion, I take it you would wait for the dropping of a bomb or the commencement of some act of violence before you would be willing to cooperate with this committee in investigating the Communist conspiracy; is that your position?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. CLARDY. I don't find it very funny, Witness. I see you are laughing.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I don't find it funny.

Mr. CLARDY. Why are you laughing, then?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Because of the wording of the question. I sat here this morning and heard somebody discuss the 25,000 Communists in this country and it is rather inconceivable for me to imagine they will drop a bomb and to put my opinion of the Communist Party into that kind of a framework seems a little far-fetched. I would say that I don't think that anybody is guilty until he commits a crime, and I do not think what people think, even if it does not agree with this committee, is a crime.

Mr. CLARDY. Then you would reserve any cooperation with this committee until that overt act has taken place, is that what you are trying to say?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I told Mr. Doyle I would be happy to cooperate with this committee to investigate when a bomb was put under the house of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Moore, of Florida. If they are overt acts I would be happy to participate in an investigation.

Mr. SCHERER. Suppose you had knowledge of the planning of an act to overthrow the Government of the United States, would you then cooperate with the committee?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. To overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes, if you had knowledge.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Will the gentleman yield in view of the fact that the witness uses the term "overt act" when I was asking the question. I wonder if the witness has in mind other things other than just dropping a bomb which might be classified as an "overt act." I intended to

ask you that a minute ago. You said until there was some "overt act" you wouldn't cooperate with the committee.

Mr. CLARDY. May I suggest to you something, to inquire of her whether she is an attorney and knows the legal meaning of the word "overt."

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I was using it as an act which violates a law, an act which is in violation of a law.

Mr. DOYLE. I know you are familiar with the decision of the United States Supreme Court in that field.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Which decision?

Mr. DOYLE. I was wondering if you were familiar with that when I used that language because you were familiar with it. In other words, you would feel that there would be no conspiracy to violently overthrow our Government in this country unless a group of people actually were moving physically to do it, is that correct?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you would not feel it was conspiracy if they were sitting around the table talking about what they would do 5 minutes later to use force and violence?

That wouldn't be an overt act in your judgment?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I have a feeling now that I am supposed to know exactly what conspiracy constitutes. But it seems to me that from your question if they were talking about overthrowing the Government by force and violence that the conspiracy, if it is in violation of a law, would be an act of violation.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I assume that with your quick response to our questions about conspiracy and your volunteering the term "overt act" and all that, that you are probably pretty familiar with what the term "conspiracy" meant because you yourself volunteered the differentiation, I think.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I don't think, or if I did it was done without my being aware I introduced conspiracy. I introduced an investigation of acts as opposed to opinions or beliefs or membership or participation.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank you.

Mr. VELDE. I feel we are getting too far afield in introducing the witness's knowledge of the law and I think it is out of the field that we should make inquiry into and I ask you, counsel, to proceed.

Mr. CLARDY. I have one more question, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I want to sum this up. Isn't it then your position that you will begin to cooperate with this committee after the fighting in the streets has started?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I think I made my position clear and I am not going to answer that question, Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick described a question period at the first meeting of this professional group to which I referred and he used this language:

There was a question period after the discussion. Our hostess, Norma, who, I discovered, was a newcomer to the group herself, holding the first meeting at her own apartment, was disturbed that democracy would also disappear after

the revolution. Democracy under capitalism, it was explained, was merely another form of the bourgeois state, and it must be destroyed.

But if there was any question of the group's not understanding the lesson, it was dispelled in the summary given by the discussion leader: "The replacement of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution. The abolition of the proletarian state, in turn, is only possible through withering away, when it is no longer necessary as a controlling force."

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you present during that discussion?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Mr. Tavenner, I think I have given my reasons for not answering any of the questions concerning Mr. Philbrick's accusations.

Mr. TAVENNER. But I understood you to advise one of the members of the committee that you would cooperate with this committee if there was anything of an overt nature, an overt act committed and the teaching of revolution is certainly held to be the equivalent of an overt act in the Dennis case which went to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Then if there are overt acts and this committee, you know, has evidence of them and is aware of them, it would seem to me that there are courts for the prosecution of such acts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, we are asking you what your version of that discussion was, if you heard it.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. There is no chance before this committee to face the man who makes these accusations and ask him about them. And I am not going to answer any questions before this committee concerning any of the accusations made by Mr. Philbrick.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what grounds?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. On the grounds firstly that I don't know if this is, you know, a strictly legal ground, if there are overt acts, I will ask questions about overt acts, and to cross-examine him and to have a regular court procedure.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee doesn't need your help in cross-examining Mr. Philbrick, but we need your help in advising what knowledge you have, if any, regarding the teaching of the overthrow of the United States by force and violence.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am not going to answer that question now. Obviously any answer I might give today might conceivably be used against me.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever live on Revere Street in Boston?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever visit that apartment on Revere Street in Boston which was referred to by Mr. Tavenner?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I will not answer that question on what has been read.

Mr. CLARDY. Is that because you are apprehensive you might incriminate yourself?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I will not testify to anything that might incriminate me.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever know anybody who lived at apartment No. 6 on Revere Street in Boston, Mass.?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am not going to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was a nationwide peace conference held in Chicago on June 29 to July 1, 1951. Did you attend it?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am not going to answer that question, sir. May I consult counsel on that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am in favor of world peace but I did not attend that conference.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of a booklet entitled "New England Speaks for Peace." It advertises the holding of a meeting.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On Saturday, January 23, 1951, an organization entitled "New England Conference for Peace" was held apparently for the purpose of electing delegates to the meeting that I just referred to in Chicago to be held on June 29 through July 1 of 1951. Did you attend the meeting of the New England Conference for Peace?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. May I see that document to which you are referring?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I hand a photostatic copy to the witness and ask that it be marked "Goldstein Exhibit No. 1" for identification only.

(The document referred to was marked for identification as "Goldstein Exhibit No. 1.")

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I find that I wholeheartedly endorse the text of that. I believe firmly in world peace but I will not answer the question as to whether or not I attended this specific meeting because I notice firstly among other things there are names of people on there who have been named before this committee and I won't involve myself.

Mr. VELDE. At this point let the record show that I have appointed a new subcommittee consisting of Mr. Clardy as chairman, Mr. Scherer and Mr. Doyle for the purpose of continuing the hearing.

(At this point Representative Velde left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. There are also persons whose names were connected with the New England Conference for Peace who were not Communists or affiliated in any way with the Communist Party, isn't that true?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I have no idea of the affiliation of the people whose names are listed there.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have no idea?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Well, if I had an idea, the very fact that this whole thing is in question before the committee would cause me to refuse to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of the sponsors of the conference?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you the exhibit again and ask you to examine it and see if your names appears on it as a sponsor?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. The names marked out in red?

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean underscored in red, not marked out.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. They seemed to be all filled in. The white letters are all filled in with red, and that is me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are able to discern your name very plainly, aren't you?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and asked that it be marked "Goldstein Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. CLARDY. It will be received in evidence.

(The document referred to was received in evidence as Goldstein Exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Turning to the reverse side of the pamphlet it is noted that reference is made to a call to the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, sponsored by the American Peace Crusade, at the Chicago Coliseum, June 29, 30, and July 1, 1950.

Then it states:

The American Peace Crusade says: There is still time to save our country from war.

and then take the position that the troops should be withdrawn from Korea and there should be a reduction and control of atomic weapons. Will you tell the committee what connection there was between the American Peace Crusade which is referred to on the back of this pamphlet and the New England Conference for Peace for which you were a sponsor?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. As I said, I endorse completely the statements on the paper which you showed me, but I will not answer the question which you just asked.

Mr. TAVENNER. For the same reasons?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think there should be made a part of the record at this point an excerpt from the Communist Peace Offensive, which was an exhaustive pamphlet prepared by this committee and published on April 1, 1951. I read from page 51.

Mr. CLARDY. Before you do that, may I inquire here about a point? Her answer to the last question was not quite clear to me. Is she standing on the fifth amendment in her refusal to answer that last question? I didn't so interpret it.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I am standing on the fifth amendment as well as others.

Mr. CLARDY. I want that clearly in the record.

Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

American Peace Crusade. With the dissolution of the Peace Information Center, the Communists established a new instrument for their peace—

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read):

offensive in the United States. This is known as the American Peace Crusade, admittedly organized in January 1951 and installed at national headquarters at 1186 Broadway, New York 1, N. Y. W. E. B. Dubois, who had served as chairman of the Peace Information Center, was among the initial sponsors of the American Peace Crusade, according to the Daily Worker of February 1, 1951, page 2. The formation of the new policy organization was announced for the first time in this same issue of the Daily Worker with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives. Other initial spon-

sors of the American Peace Crusade included the following known Communists: Paul Robeson, Ben Gold, Howard Fast, Alex Sirota, Albert Kahn, Maurice Travis—

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read):

Harry Bridges, Ernest DeMaio, and Herbert Biberman.

Do you have any knowledge of the part that the Communist Party played, if any, through the American Peace Crusade or otherwise or attempting to organize the New England Conference for Peace?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well to add as a part of the record the statement of the Secretary of State on February 20, 1951, with reference to the two objectives.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the American Peace Crusade as shown on the back of the pamphlet introduced in evidence as Goldstein's Exhibit No. 1.

The statement of the Secretary of State is as follows:

In this latest manifestation of partisans of peace, American Peace Crusade, or Peace Pilgrimage, or whatever name it goes by at the time, the same people are calling for the same things, but this time they have added two more points: The first is that the Peace Crusade calls for the United Nations forces to withdraw from Korea; encouragement has been called for an immediate withdrawal from Korea, too. The encouragement of that wish to withdraw from Korea because if we do withdraw it will mean we are not willing to resist aggression wherever it may break out. Voluntary withdrawal from Korea would be a clear indication to the forces of international communism that the United States as the leader of the forces of the United Nations—

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read):

was abdicating its responsibilities, abandoning its allies and renouncing the moral force which had made this country what it is.

I understood you to say that you volunteered the information that you agreed with the objectives of the New England Conference for Peace. Does that apply also to the objective of the American Peace Crusade?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. May I see that document again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. You are referring to the negotiations and sentiment among the Big Five and the withdrawal of troops?

Mr. TAVENNER. The withdrawal of troops of Korea and the reduction and control of atomic weapons and all other weapons.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Well, it said withdrawal of all non-Korean troops and a peaceful and useful world? Yes, I subscribe to that. I think there are millions of Americans who do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become active as a member of this organization toward the accomplishment of its objectives?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I would like to answer that this way. I think that for a citizen to hold opinions and to hold those opinions without in any way participating in what is going on in America to realize her opinions is a sign of bad citizenship, and I think that I have participated in every way that is open to me to use the most positive expressions of good citizenship when I have believed in things I have done

everything legal to realize those things, but I am not going to answer any questions about organizations or associations or affiliations of any specific organizations in which I have participated, and I am not going to do that because of the imputations here that there is something disloyal or subversive about these things, and I think that any answer I use might possibly be used against me and I am going to claim my right under the fifth amendment not to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. But you do endorse in full the things the organizations stand for, if I understand your question correctly.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I endorse certain specific things, like I believe in world peace.

Mr. CLARDY. I am asking you this. You have been shown a document—

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I believe in those things which I read out, yes.

Mr. CLARDY. And you have, as I understand your statement, done what you could to promote those ends?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I have done what I could because I think that for a citizen not to is a sign of bad citizenship and I think that I have been a very good citizen. I think too that my exercise of the first and fifth amendments is a sign of good citizenship. I don't think you should be asking me about my beliefs and associations.

Mr. TAVENNER. You volunteered your testimony on that. I did not ask you.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I did not ask to come down here. I was subpoenaed down here.

Mr. TAVENNER. What I want to know is what connection did the Communist Party have with that movement, if you are willing to tell us.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that on the first and fifth amendments, specifically on the fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am reminded of one question I did not ask.

Mr. CLARDY. Go ahead.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Tavenner, on both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have Communist Party meetings ever been held in your home, to your knowledge?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever received any compensation from the Communist Party?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Do you mean salary? I don't know what you mean.

Mr. SCHERER. Not necessarily salary.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. You mean money?

Mr. SCHERER. Money or anything of value from the Communist Party directly or indirectly.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I have never received any compensation from—I have outlined my employment that I have received compensation from but I have not received any compensation from the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever contribute anything of value to the Communist Party?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. May I say just one thing?

Mr. CLARDY. Just a moment.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. CLARDY. In the document that you say you approve, or rather, you approve of the statements that are set out therein, it is implied at least that insofar as Korea is concerned, we should forthwith and immediately withdraw. Now, that is a fair assumption from the express language. Is that your opinion as of now?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. That all troops should be withdrawn?

Mr. CLARDY. American troops.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. The thing which I said was all non-Korean troops, including Chinese.

Mr. CLARDY. I am asking you if you think American troops should be withdrawn forthwith?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. Yes; as well as Chinese, as well as any non-Koreans.

Mr. CLARDY. Questions have been asked you as to whether you are now a member of the Communist Party. Have you ever been a member of the party?

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever belonged to one of these things we call a Communist front that you could identify as such?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever attended meetings of any Communist front of any sort?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I decline to answer that question.

(At this point Mrs. Goldstein conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any further questions, counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. CLARDY. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused from the subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. There is not.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. May I make—

Mr. CLARDY. You may not make any statements to this committee.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. There is an imputation of disloyalty—

Mr. CLARDY. You are excused.

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I would like, please, to make one statement.

Mr. CLARDY. You are not permitted to make any statement. You are not permitted to make any Communist harangue for the benefit of the audience. Please leave the stand, or shall I have you removed?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. There is a very big difference between the way you treated the witnesses this morning.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you call the next witness?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I would like, please, to make a statement.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you escort her out, Mr. Nixon, or have someone do so?

Mrs. GOLDSTEIN. I don't have to have anyone escort me out.

Mr. CLARDY. Call your next witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. I call Arthur L. Levy.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you swear that the testimony that you are about to give before this committee is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LEVY. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR L. LEVY, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
DAVID REIN**

Mr. LEVY. May I request that no pictures be taken?

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask your indulgence and we will work it that way, if you don't object. We will ask them if they have any picture taking that they do it before you testify.

Mr. LEVY. No; I wish no picture taking.

Mr. CLARDY. Have they taken any of you thus far?

Mr. LEVY. Not of me directly.

Mr. CLARDY. It looks as they are after more attractive subjects. They probably will shoot you after the testimony is over and I will have no control over it then.

May I address myself to the photographers. We have had a request, to which we acceded, that no pictures be taken during the course of the testimony, but, as I have informed him, after the testimony is completed and he is excused there is nothing I can do about it.

Mr. LEVY. You have no control even after the hearing is ended?

Mr. CLARDY. No; I have no control over them.

Mr. LEVY. Will you have those plates destroyed?

Mr. CLARDY. Sir?

Mr. LEVY. I will ask them to refrain from using them and I would like them destroyed.

Mr. KUNZIG. May I request that we go on with the hearing?

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. If you were accompanied by counsel, will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. REIN. David Rein, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Levy, will you state your full name and present address?

Mr. LEVY. Arthur L. Levy, 44-B Schuyler Heights, Menands, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born?

Mr. LEVY. In Connecticut on August 2, 1917.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you outline your educational background?

Mr. LEVY. Grammar and high school, received a bachelor's degree in chemistry and a doctor of philosophy degree in chemistry.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you outline your employment background to the committee?

Mr. LEVY. From when, sir?

Mr. KUNZIG. From the time you finished your education.

Mr. LEVY. I am now on the staff of the chemistry department of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and have been so since I received the doctorate in chemistry in 1948.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you have any employment prior to that time except for minor part-time employment?

Mr. LEVY. I was in the Army up to 1945. I was a teacher, high-school teacher before that, 1940 to 1942, and I worked as a chemist for a year after getting my bachelor's degree in chemistry.

Mr. KUNZIG. What year was that?

Mr. LEVY. 1938 to 1939.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where did you work as a chemist?

Mr. LEVY. The Brigeport Testing Laboratory.

Mr. KUNZIG. You originally were scheduled for appearance before the committee on April 14, 1953, which appearance was postponed for your convenience until today, is that right?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. You set forth, I believe, in a letter to the committee that you were attending a chemical meeting in New York City, and I want to ask you if, during your attendance at that meeting on your part in New York, you discussed appearing before this committee with any members of the group or any people other than private counsel?

Mr. LEVY. Any members of what group?

Mr. KUNZIG. The group to the meeting which you were attending.

Mr. LEVY. I discussed it with counsel in New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. With counsel?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I am perfectly willing to answer that but I would like to know if I may read a statement developing my answer after that.

Mr. CLARDY. You may answer it first and then if you have some explanation that is not too long, you will be privileged to do so.

Mr. LEVY. I have a short one-page statement.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you answer the question?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer that question under the fifth amendment which protects me against inquisitions without proper legal counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have proper legal counsel, isn't that correct?

Mr. LEVY. I have legal counsel with me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Not proper?

Mr. LEVY. Oh, yes; he is quite proper. Let me say inquisitions without proper legal procedure also.

Mr. KUNZIG. You just made the statement that you were perfectly willing to answer that question.

Mr. LEVY. Yes, I have.

Mr. KUNZIG. And 1 second later you said you will not answer.

Mr. LEVY. That is my answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Your answer is that you won't answer.

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer it on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. On the grounds of the fifth amendment?

Mr. LEVY. And the first amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. I think I am moved to interject at this point that that is not answering the question as I understood your statement at all. I am not going to argue with you but I want you to know that you were playing on words when you said you were going to answer.

Mr. LEVY. I am sorry. I will accept your interpretation of the English grammar.

Mr. CLARDY. In the future, if you intend to decline, we will shorten this up.

Mr. LEVY. May I read my statement?

Mr. CLARDY. Not in view of the fact that you have not answered. If you answer "Yes" or "No" you will be permitted.

Proceed, counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is it correct that, prior to coming here today to testify, you discussed the type of testimony you were to give with officials of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. During your current tenure at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institution, are you at the present time affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer that; the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you discussed the Communist indoctrination of either students or faculty members with official organizers of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. Have I discussed what?

Mr. KUNZIG. Indoctrination of students or faculty with official organizers of the Communist Party.

Mr. LEVY. I have never discussed indoctrination with anybody, whatever that word means.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't have any idea what the word "indoctrination" means?

Mr. LEVY. In its usual bad sense, I have an understanding of the word. In that sense, I have never discussed that with anybody.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you rephrase that and use simpler language, if you don't mind?

Mr. KUNZIG. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Have you ever attempted to teach Communist ideology during the time that you have been a professor?

Mr. LEVY. No, I have not.

Mr. KUNZIG. As a professor, have you ever attempted to recruit others into the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer that on the same ground.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever attempted to recruit or invited your students to join the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. It is a loaded question. I have never discussed politics with my students. I have never asked them to join any political party.

Mr. CLARDY. You are not being asked whether you requested them to join a political party, but something entirely different.

Mr. LEVY. He said the Communist Party. It is a political party.

Mr. CLARDY. He didn't say political party, and we do not interpret the Communist Party to be such. With that understanding, will you answer the question?

Mr. LEVY. I have not asked any of my students ever to join either the Republican Party, Democratic Party, the Socialist Party, the American Labor Party, or the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you assume that the Communist Party is exactly the same as any other form of political party?

Mr. LEVY. Of course not. Of course I don't assume it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you explain what you believe the Communist Party to be in America?

Mr. LEVY. I would rather not get into a discussion of that. I think it is fruitless.

Mr. KUNZIG. You decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, and the first.

Mr. KUNZIG. But you are using the fifth on the ground that it tends to incriminate you?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, incrimination and inquisition without proper legal procedure.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever urged other professors or teachers or friends at your present institution to join the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Levy, this committee, as you well know, is currently making an investigation to determine whether or not members of the Communist Party are represented in educational institutions in the form of teachers or faculty members. Do you possess any knowledge of the existence of members of the Communist Party in our educational institutions as teachers or faculty members. If so, would you help us by answering to that effect?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Bernard Shuldiner?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Bernard Shuldiner's occupation in 1950?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be the Communist Party organizer for the Albany, N. Y. area?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Levy, much has been written and said to substantiate the fact that the American Labor Party, as presently constituted in New York, is under the control of the Communist Party. Are you a member of the American Labor Party?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. In 1951, were you a signer of an Albany County American Labor Party nominating petition?

Mr. LEVY. Probably. I don't remember it specifically, but I imagine so.

Mr. KUNZIG. You imagine so?

Mr. LEVY. If I may say, I am a registered member of the American Labor Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. In 1952, were you a candidate for membership on the Albany County Committee of the American Labor Party?

Mr. LEVY. I believe so, yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you assist this committee by giving any information, if it lies within your knowledge, as to whether the American Labor Party is under the control of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. LEVY. Would you restate the question, please?

Mr. KUNZIG. I will restate the question.

Mr. CLARDY. Will the reporter read the question, please?

(The following question was read:)

Can you assist this committee by giving any information, if it lies within your knowledge, as to whether the American Labor Party is under the control of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. LEVY. I think I decline to answer that on the previously cited grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you affiliated with the Tri-City Civil Liberties Committee, which committee comprises Schenectady, Troy, and the Albany, New York, area?

Mr. LEVY. I decline.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you possess any knowledge of the role the members of the Communist Party in these areas play in operation and control of the Tri-City Civil Liberties Committee?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know Dr. Daniel Fine, who testified before this committee several days ago?

Mr. LEVY. I believe I know him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. Go back to the previous question and read it, Mr. Reporter.

(The following question was read:)

Did you know Dr. Daniel Fine, who testified before this committee several days ago?

Mr. LEVY. I believe I knew the gentleman.

Mr. CLARDY. What creates the uncertainty?

Mr. LEVY. I remember hearing the name mentioned while I was in school. He was in the medical school at the time and I think I met him once or twice.

Mr. CLARDY. You know who he is?

Mr. LEVY. I have seen the publicity in the press.

Mr. CLARDY. Don't you have some recollection as to the schooldays?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you known him since the schooldays?

Mr. LEVY. No.

Mr. SCHERER. You have no contact with him?

Mr. LEVY. No.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever know Joe Cort?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Emmanuel Robinstein?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer. These are all people whom I have not seen for at least 5 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. When you knew them 5 years ago, did you know them to be members of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. So whether it was 5 years ago or whenever it was, you still decline to answer?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer on the same ground.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Ted Polumbaum, who testified before this committee a few days ago?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Paul Zilsel?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Paul Zilch?

Mr. LEVY. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Zilsel as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Hal Woerner?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, I think so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Ben Dontzin?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, I think so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Mike Russo?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't want to answer. You decline to answer whether you even knew him?

Mr. LEVY. Yes. Will you identify him further?

Mr. KUNZIG. As a member of the Yale student branch of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him while you were at Yale?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer. It only confuses it. It is a very common name.

Mr. KUNZIG. Russo is a very common name?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, in Connecticut where there are a lot of people of Italian descent.

Mr. KUNZIG. Isn't it a fact that all these people we have just mentioned whom you say you knew but refused to identify any further, isn't it a fact that you and these others were members of a student group of the Communist Party at Yale University?

Mr. LEVY. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

I would like to point out that in my declining to answer and relying on the fifth amendment, I do not share the views expressed by this committee that such reliance is conviction of criminal—

Mr. CLARDY. That is all very well, witness, but there is no question pending.

Mr. LEVY. I just want it understood for the record that I am using the fifth amendment to protect me in my innocence—

Mr. CLARDY. If you are innocent of anything of any sort, you have only to speak freely and that factor will be published.

Mr. LEVY. I don't think that follows.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean to protect you from innocence from membership in the party?

Mr. LEVY. Innocence, period.

Mr. SCHERER. You don't mean to tell us you are not a member of the party?

Mr. LEVY. Just to protect me of my innocence of any illegal act, and things of that sort.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is all.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Doyle, do you have any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Is there any reason this witness should be retained any longer?

Mr. KUNZIG. Not that I know of.

Mr. CLARDY. You are excused from the subpena.

(The witness was excused.)

Mr. CLARDY. The committee will be in recess until 10:30 a. m., Monday, April 27, 1953.

(Thereupon, at 4:07 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10:30 a. m., Monday, April 27, 1953.)

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION (Education—Part 4)

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:56 a. m., in the caucus room, room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Donald L. Jackson (appearance noted in transcript), Kit Clardy, Francis E. Walter (appearance noted in transcript), Morgan M. Moulder, and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; and Courtney E. Owens, investigator.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will please come to order.

Let the record show that I have appointed a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Mr. Clardy, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, for the purposes of this hearing. All these members are present.

Mr. Counsel, will you proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will Mr. John Henry Reynolds come forward, please?

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN HENRY REYNOLDS

Mr. TAVENNER. State your name, please, sir.

Mr. REYNOLDS. John Henry Reynolds.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Reynolds?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was born in Lansdowne, Pa., in 1907.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is the practice of the committee to permit counsel to accompany any witness, and the witness has the privilege at any time of conferring with counsel, and I wanted to make certain that

you knew of that and that you have the right to have counsel with you if you desire.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation, Mr. Reynolds?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am a teacher, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. REYNOLDS. At the University of Florida.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. REYNOLDS. At this point I think, after having identified myself, I will now say that I refuse to answer any further questions on the ground that some answer of mine might tend to incriminate me. I am sorry to make this, but that, I believe, is my constitutional right to do so.

I also wish to state, with all due respect to the committee, that I believe that this kind of investigation is detrimental to American education, and that is a second reason for my refusal to answer. I think that it will, undoubtedly, if continued, lead to an end to free investigation and discussion by teachers and students.

Mr. VELDE. Professor, let me put you straight on an issue or two.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. It has been the rule, and I suppose it will continue, in the procedure before this committee that if a witness will answer questions put to him by counsel and by members of the committee—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Then he might have the right and is welcome to criticize and condemn the committee for its methods, but until that time we certainly cannot allow you that right until you answer the question put to you by counsel. You understand this is an investigating committee set up by the House of Representatives for the purpose of investigating and reporting facts regarding subversive influences throughout the country, and we feel from the evidence we have had before this committee relative to your work as a teacher and professor in one of our leading universities that you can, if you would, give some valuable help to the committee in performing the function imposed upon it by Congress. But we cannot allow you to, as a matter of course, proceed to condemn us, castigate us for doing the job that we are asked to do by Congress until at least you answer the questions put to you.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Sir, I did not mean to castigate the committee. I am sorry if that was understood. I merely disagreed.

Mr. CLARDY. As I understand it, you are invoking at least what you conceive to be the constitutional privilege of declining to answer?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. I think you are mistaken in so doing, and I do not think that it protects you in this question, and let me refresh your memory.

Counsel has merely asked you to detail your academic studies or tell us something about your schooling. Now, there is nothing in that that has anything to do, by way of reflection against you in any way. We are merely trying to find out something of your educational background. Perhaps later if we reach the point and should ask you a question about whether you are a member of the Communist Party,

and that sort of thing, you might have some reason to raise it, but won't you go along with the committee up to that point, at least?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think so.

I went to Harvard School, Harvard University, and graduated in 1929. I got a master of arts from Harvard in 1930 and then spent some graduate years at Harvard further. I spent some time at Brown University. I am at a loss to remember what year I finally stopped.

Mr. CLARDY. As a graduate of the University of Michigan, your being a Harvard graduate wouldn't be the best recommendation to me, but it certainly doesn't incriminate you.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you at Harvard University, either as a student or instructor, if you were an instructor there?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am sorry; I don't remember the last year, which it was. I haven't an actual record of when I was, because it was generally a question of paying \$50 for further graduate work with advice, so that it runs somewhere around 1936 or 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you go from Harvard University when you left there in 1936 or 1937?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That, I think, I shall not answer, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I didn't get the answer.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was a refusal.

Mr. VELDE. Are we to understand that it is on the ground of your right under the Constitution and the amendments thereto?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you engaged in the teaching profession immediately after you left Harvard University and the few years succeeding that, or were you self-employed during that period?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am afraid I shall refuse that one, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed as an instructor at the University of New Hampshire between 1941 and 1943?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am going to refuse that one, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what grounds? On what possible grounds would you refuse to answer whether you taught at the University from 1941 to 1943?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Because my answer might possibly tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Reynolds, during the course of the hearings conducted by this committee where the committee was interested in obtaining the facts as to whether the Communist Party was endeavoring to infiltrate the teaching profession, the methods used by the Communist Party to attain its objectives, and also what those objectives were, we have had the testimony of Mr. Robert Gorham Davis. Mr. Davis testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party while he was at Harvard University between the years 1937 and 1939. At the end of 1939 he withdrew from the Communist Party.

In describing the operations of the Communist Party in an organized group at Harvard University, he identified you as having been a member of it.

He was asked this question:

Were you acquainted with a person by the name of John Henry Reynolds?

And the answer as given by Mr. Davis was as follows:

Yes, and I recall that one of the emergency meetings that I spoke of that occurred after the pact was held at his house.

Now, Mr. Davis had described the effort made by the Communist Party to hold the members of the teaching profession who were members of the party in line with the Communist Party principles after the signing of the pact between the Soviet Union and Germany, which was in August of 1939, and that is the period of time that he was talking about as having attended a Communist Party meeting in your house.

There has been other testimony which would show that you should have very distinct and detailed knowledge of the operation of the Communist Party there.

Dr. William T. Martin, head of the mathematics department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, testified that he joined the Communist Party in 1938 and left it in 1946. He described in his testimony that he met with a group of Communist Party members composed of teachers from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

In describing this group of members of the Communist Party, he answered certain questions asked by Mr. Kunzig, counsel for this committee. This question was asked:

Mr. KUNZIG. While we are talking about this broader group, can you remember any of the names of people who were in the broader group that you met with as Communists?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe a Mr. John H. Reynolds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know what his position was at that time?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't recall his exact position. It was some—again I believe—minor position at Harvard.

Mr. KUNZIG. Minor position at Harvard?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know where he is today?

Dr. MARTIN. I think he's at one of the—I think he may be in Florida at one of the universities, but I am not sure of the precise one.

Dr. Norman Levinson was also a witness before the committee. He testified that he became a member of the Communist Party in 1937 and remained in the Communist Party until 1945. During this time he was teaching at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He defined a group of Communist Party members which met near Harvard Square.

(Representative Kit Clardy left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. He was asked this question by Mr. Kunzig:

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you recall any of the names of the fellow members of the Communist Party with whom you met in this group that you are now referring to?

Dr. LEVINSON. Well, having read the records of the Davis testimony and having been here yesterday, I have been refreshed quite a bit on some of these names which I had certainly forgotten, actually; but I do remember—I think I remember this group better than any other group, because it was the first one. It made quite an impression on me. This group met in the rooms of, I believe, Herbert Robbins and John Reynolds. I think they shared an apartment in Cambridge, and I think that is where we met.

(Representative Kit Clardy entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, if that testimony is correct, you should be in a position to render invaluable service to the Congress by giving it the benefit of the information you have.

So my first question is, was the identification of you as a member of the Communist Party while you were at Harvard, as made by Dr. Levinson, Dr. Martin, and Dr. Davis true or was it false?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On the grounds that you previously assigned?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Reynolds, are you acquainted with the investigator to the committee who is sitting to my left, Mr. Owens?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Owens come to see you in March in Florida and discuss with you the matter which we are now questioning you about?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt you a moment, Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. No question has yet been put to you as to whether or not you are now a member of the Communist Party. Perhaps it might lessen your resistance to answering the other questions if you were assured that you will be given ample opportunity to let the world know and in cooperation with its committee that you are not a present member, if that is indeed the fact. The evidence that you have heard read to you obviously is upon the public record and the principal reason for your being here is to give you an opportunity to explain and to let the world know your side of the picture.

Now, if you are under the apprehension that we are going to ask for the answer to the question that counsel is asking you and then not give you an opportunity to deny present membership, assuming that is the fact, I want to set you right now and let you know that we like to help you in that regard if you are no longer a member. I am saying this in the hope that you reconsider because I think you could do yourself and your Government a great favor if you will answer that question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I still will continue to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not true that Mr. Owens came to see you on March 26, 1953, and you stated to him that you would discuss this matter with him in the presence of certain officials of your university and in fact an interview took place in the office of the dean of the university college, Winston Woodward Little, and in the presence of the department head, Prof. William Graves Carleton, and Dean Little, you denied ever having been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, if it be true that you denied in the presence of the dean of your university and the department head, Prof. William Graves Carleton, that you had ever been a member of the Communist Party, why would you decline to answer such a question here?

I will put the question this way: Why do you not take the position now that you are not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. REYNOLDS. For the same reason I have given before. I have two reasons: One is constitutional, and the other is moral.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refuse to answer that also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refuse to answer that also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you relying on the same grounds previously assigned?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; both constitutional and moral.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have a question, Mr. Clardy?

Mr. CLARDY. I just want to repeat what I have said earlier, Witness, obviously, since you were identified as you have heard in the testimony of several other witnesses and it was thought only fair to give you an opportunity to appear here and to say what you had to say, I think you should reconsider your decision and give careful thought to it.

The committee has no desire to do any harm to anyone, but if there is any harm done to you it will be done by yourself. This is your opportunity to tell the world and to tell those that you are associated with down there that you are not a member of the party, the Communist Party; and by your cooperation you can be of tremendous help to your Government, to your Congress, and we are, of course, speaking for the Congress.

Won't you reconsider and answer at least the question as to whether you are a Communist today?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am sorry, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. You are not as sorry as I am, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Yes, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. You are begging him to say that he isn't a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I wanted to have removed, that doubt. As one who has had considerable education, I take it you must have been familiar with the things the Communist Party stands for, is that not true?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That would certainly be true; yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. What was that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. You have a fair general knowledge of the theory behind the Socialist Government of Russia, haven't you, and you know something about the fact that there is a worldwide conspiracy, don't you?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Knowing that, and knowing that there is testimony linking you with that party, that conspiracy, sir, don't you think you are doing yourself a disservice by not answering, unless you want to leave distinctly the impression that you are presently a part of that conspiracy? Can't you see that, sir?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand what you are saying, sir; but I am afraid that my answer will still have to be a refusal.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. CLARDY. Are you afraid that a truthful answer would reveal the fact that you are a member of the party? Is that the cause of your apprehension, because if it isn't, I cannot comprehend it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I still have to refuse, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. What was that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I still must refuse.

Mr. CLARDY. I must tell you frankly, sir, that by persisting in this attitude that you cannot help but leave the impression with me, at least,

that you are a member of the party, and since I do not want to do an injustice to anyone who is not, that is why I pressed you.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in Harvard University, did you become a member of the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refuse to answer that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. What subject or subjects do you teach as a member of the faculty of the University of Florida at the present time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am afraid I will have to refuse that one, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Sir?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will have to refuse to answer that.

Mr. CLARDY. You refuse to answer that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. The committee knows what you are teaching, and we merely want to get that one in the record. I think he should be directed to answer that question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. I agree with you on that. This is a question that cannot possibly incriminate you in any way.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I teach American institutions and world civilization.

Mr. CLARDY. Perhaps you can tell me what that is, since we didn't have it at the University of Michigan.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is a general course in social science.

Mr. CLARDY. It has to do, then, directly with the subject of our form of government?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. How it operates, including how the Congress operates, I assume?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Does it include a course in Marxism?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have a comparison of our form of government with that of any other form of government?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Does that involve in some way a comparison of socialist ideas against the theory upon which we operate?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; and always favorable to the United States.

Mr. CLARDY. Always favorable to the United States?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. You are, then, a capitalist, I take it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am a capitalist, not only at heart but in pocket-book also.

Mr. CLARDY. Having gone that far, do you not see what incalculable harm you are doing to yourself by failing to tell whether you are or are not a Communist at this time? You leave us in a confused state. I am going to ask you again; are you now a Communist?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refuse to answer the question, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Are there any further questions, Mr. Clardy?

Mr. CLARDY. No.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Professor, I think I heard you answer, did I not, that you thought this committee was unconstitutional?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No. What I was saying was that I thought this kind of investigation would lead to restrictions on the freedom of investigation and discussion by teachers, and that is the reason for my second objection. I believe, with Milton, that free discussion is altogether necessary, that the truth contend until falsehood fail and truth will prevail.

Mr. DOYLE. Some of us do not disagree with Mr. Milton either. Neither you nor any other teacher has the exclusive proprietary rights in that theory.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. There is nothing new about that theory.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But what I meant to say was that I am afraid this instills fear in teachers, fear to take up questions that are controversial, and in doing so will lead to, well, let us say fear to present things boldly.

Mr. DOYLE. This committee has been in existence many years.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think it has already had that tendency, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. This committee was expressly set forth as a standing committee of Congress in the 79th session of Congress in 1945.

Have you been in any state of fear in your classroom since 1945 as a result of Congress instituting this committee? Have you had a sense of limitation in your teaching of American institutions at the University of Florida or otherwise since 1945?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think there has been some limitation: yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you if you have.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have felt it.

Mr. DOYLE. To what extent? Describe it to us, if you will.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, for instance, I felt that I just did not want to teach international relations, which I once taught, because the subject was getting hot, and what you might say might be misinterpreted by a student and then you would be in trouble. That is the kind of thing.

Mr. DOYLE. How far back did you have any such sense of limitation? How many years ago?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, I should say since the end of the war.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, of course, this committee as near as I recall has not been questioning any college professors until the last year or so that I recall.

Mr. VELDE. Well, the chairman reminds the gentleman, and I am sure the gentleman remembers the professors at the University of California, a cell at the radiation laboratory who were brought before this committee as far back as 1948.

Mr. DOYLE. I stand corrected. I was thinking more of the eastern universities.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you feel that a member of the Communist Party should be free to teach and instruct in the American universities?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Your answer is no?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; that is my answer.

Mr. DOYLE. Your answer is no?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Why would that be true? Why would you feel that no member of the American Communist Party should be a college professor in an American college?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, he might be biased.

Mr. DOYLE. I beg your pardon?

Mr. REYNOLDS. He might be biased.

Mr. DOYLE. He might be partisan?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you use the word "biased" or "partisan"?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Either one.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, what do you refer to when you say that he might be biased or partisan, and biased for or against what as a Communist professor?

Mr. REYNOLDS. He might feel himself bound to teach something that wouldn't be true. That is all.

Mr. DOYLE. Would you please illustrate? Can you help the committee to understand by giving us an illustration?

Mr. REYNOLDS. What I think is that it is rather obvious that he might be in favor of certain policies in regard to Russia, particularly.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean that a member of the Communist Party in America in the college classroom would reasonably be biased to such—

Mr. REYNOLDS. He might or might not. It would entirely depend upon the particular individual. It would entirely depend upon his own intellectual honesty, shall we say. And I think that there is actually a danger that people could become, shall we say, biased the other way too and not present the facts as they see them, however wrongly they may see them, and it is not honest teaching unless they can. I very sincerely believe that, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Calling to your attention that this is a standing committee of this Congress under Public Law 601 and that our express assignment by your Congress is to investigate the extent of subversive activities arising in this country or imported from other countries, how would you as a professor at an American university, how would you look into and investigate the matter of subversive activities of an individual who happened to be a college professor, other than by some such committee as this? How would you handle it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I don't know if I would want to handle it that way. I think it would be up to the State university or whatever university it was to see for themselves. I think it is a question of the university itself, not a question for governmental authorities to investigate. I just don't agree with that. It means that the State interferes in the university itself. I just don't agree with it.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you think our American universities in which you have taught are equipped by possessing qualified personnel for instance to investigate subversive activities of members of the college staff, if there are such? Or could it be handled by the American university prior to employing a professor in the first instance?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think they can tell what a teacher is.

Mr. DOYLE. What?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Tell by his teaching; the university can tell by his teaching.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, go into the classroom and sit there and police the person to see what he is teaching?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would prefer the university to do that rather than the committee. I really would. I don't mean any disrespect for this committee. I mean I object to it on the ground of a governmental institution interfering with the university and its teaching staff.

Mr. VELDE. I think, Professor, that you are trying to leave the inference that this committee is engaged in investigating un-American activities, subversive activities in colleges and universities for the purpose of acquiring or setting up a blacklist of teachers in the American colleges and universities. I assure you that the committee has no intention of doing anything like that at all. We are merely carrying on the duties imposed upon us by Congress to ascertain the extent of subversive influence in the universities, whether it be in colleges or any other free American institution. As far as the hiring and firing of personnel is concerned, that remains strictly up to the administrative officials of the colleges and universities, and we are not interfering with that at all. I don't like to have you leave that inference.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly, sir. I understand that, but I was just struck about 3 or 4 weeks ago by a report in the newspapers. Now I know that that may not be the committee, but it was reporting and it seemed that the effect of it had been what you are saying the committee has no intention of doing, as reported in the press.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you trying to tell us that those in your profession should be set aside and not investigated, but it is all right to investigate my profession and all other groups? In other words, in your singling out the teaching profession as exempt from the investigation of Congress.

Mr. REYNOLDS. No, certainly if someone is breaking the law—

Mr. CLARDY. If you are saying that your group should be exempt from the investigative processes of the American Congress, unless you are saying that, aren't you implying that there should be no investigation into communism and subversive activities at all by this Congress through this committee? Isn't that the only answer you can possibly reach, unless you are pleading for a special exemption because you are a member of the teaching profession?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, it may sound that way, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. It surely does.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am just saying what happens to people when they are in this position, where they have to deal with controversial subjects and how it is in a sense stifling.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you think that anyone who has a completely clear conscience need fear anything from their Congress?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is not only the Congress, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you are extending your criticism to everybody, then, are you?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No, I am not.

Mr. CLARDY. Who do you exclude? That last statement sounds as though you had everybody in mind.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one question, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Professor, in view of your answers both to me and to Mr. Clardy, I assume that you are opposed to Congress having any

investigating committee in the area of subversive activities, is that correct?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I don't know how to answer that one, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I don't know how to answer that one, sir.

I think they have some investigating powers, they not only have them but they should exercise them, but how far they should go, I don't know.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. I think that is a very fair answer, because I assume from the way you have been answering that you could not answer that question with a specific answer that would be clear enough to give us your understanding.

Now, let me ask you this, our distinguished counsel has read you the names of three American citizens. You knew all of them personally, didn't you?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refuse to answer that one, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I will assume for the purposes of my question that you knew them personally because they were all fellows in education with you, according to your own testimony. You heard the evidence read that they had identified you as a member of the Communist Party. They identified you as such before this committee.

We are assigned by the United States Congress to investigate any individual whom the record shows is in the judgment of the committee and the evidence, subversive. There is no question in the mind of the committee and the cumulative evidence that the Communist Party is subversive. Therefore, when we have three men of high repute identify you as a member of the Communist Party, we naturally subpenea you to find out how you can help this congressional committee to better handle the problem of subversive activities in the United States. If you wouldn't subpenea a person in your own place and position, how would you get the person identified by three fellow educators as a Communist? What process would you take as an American citizen to help get the facts?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I don't know, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all.

Mr. MOULDER. Assuming that a man was engaged in the teaching profession at a college or university and was not a member of the Communist Party but attended Communist Party meetings because of his interest or curiosity into governmental affairs and the philosophy of government, don't you believe that such a man would be rendering a greater service to the educational institutions in this country by clarifying it in that manner and stating that he was there just because of his curiosity and his studies and not a member of the Communist Party, than to rely upon the fifth amendment and decline to answer such a question?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am afraid I have to refuse that one, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. I have several points which I would like to take up. I must apologize for not having been here at the time you gave most of your testimony, Professor Reynolds.

You were called before the committee, not because of the fact that you are a professor or a figure in American education, but because of identifications of you by three persons under oath who testified that

you were a onetime member of the Communist Party. I think that should be made very clear for the record. You are here as a result of these identifications which lay upon the committee the obligation to pursue the matter.

Your suggestion, as I understand it, that the universities themselves should be charged with the task of finding out who the Communists on the campus are is the point I want to bring up.

Is it not the case that the pursuit of such a program would create, in effect, a police state upon an individual campus to the extent that students would be placed in the position of spying upon the instructors, that faculty members would be engaged in espionage activities against each other, and an impossible situation would develop upon a university campus where such a program was being carried on?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If someone were not teaching communism at the university, I don't see what there is to investigate. It is a question of whether or not a teacher teaches communism.

Mr. JACKSON. I think it goes further than that, Professor. I think that it goes to the fundamental premise that one in accepting membership in the Communist Party accepts the discipline and directives of the Communist Party in full. I think that membership in the Communist Party connotes acceptance of the discipline and the directives.

(Representative Kit Clardy left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. JACKSON. In the first place, the university has no facilities for conducting such investigations. It has no investigators. It has no authority to subpenea a witness. It has no authority to place a witness under oath once he is subpeneaed. All of these things are essential for a proper investigation. The very fact that when you were called before the university authorities and were questioned as to your membership in the party, you denied such association. Am I correct in that statement, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(Representative Kit Clardy returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. JACKSON. Your own case, to me, is evidence per se that a university cannot get to the facts in a matter of this kind without the adequate authority which is made available to investigating committees. There is no compulsion of an oath. It is simply a matter of questions and answers which may or may not have validity, which may or may not be true. However, you are here today under the compulsion of an oath and you are asked the questions, or some of the questions, that were asked by the university officials, questions which at this time you decline to answer. I think the present instance makes the point exactly that the university authorities are not equipped to pursue an investigation of communism on the campus.

In the second place, the information relative to a Communist professor or one suspected of membership in the Communist Party is very seldom developed upon the campus where the professor or educator is currently employed. It is generally developed many hundreds or thousands of miles away and comes in the form of identifications under oath which have to do with a period many years past in some instances. I make these points to counter the suggestion that the universities as such are equipped in any way to conduct thorough-going investigations, such as are required in the instance of members

of the faculty who may have been at some time in the past members of the Communist Party.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Do I understand, then, that you would have the university fire members of the faculty who have previously been members of the Communist Party? Is that my understanding?

Mr. JACKSON. That I believe is a matter for the decision of the authorities. In a tax-supported institution, the costs of which are borne by the American people, people in many cases whose husbands, sons, and brothers are engaged in the struggle against Communists in Korea, there is certainly a valid reason for the nonemployment of Communist teachers. If public opinion demands that Communist professors not be employed, then I believe that the university authorities must make the ultimate decision as to whether or not those who are Communists or those who decline to answer under oath as to their membership are then confronted with the decision as to what course of action should be followed. That is not the function of this committee nor has this committee suggested at any time to any university, to any educational institution that such faculty member should be discharged. I think that would be a matter quite outside the scope of committee jurisdiction. We would be entering into an area in which we certainly had no jurisdiction whatever. We make no suggestions with reference to the action of the university or the educational institution following the declination of a witness to answer.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. CLARDY. That is exactly why I suggested to you earlier that if you are not now a member of the party after having been identified by three other witnesses before the committee, you could be doing yourself as well as your Government a service in answering the questions, because this committee has gone on record frequently where a man has rejected the Communist Party, we have gone on record and have suggested that he has performed a noteworthy deed for his Government, and we have not attempted to designate other than the method I just suggested. That was the reason I suggested what I did, previously. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. Professor, let me say, for your own benefit, for the benefit of the press and the public, as I have said before when we had professors appear here as witnesses from any particular college or university, your testimony or performance here should in no way reflect upon the integrity or patriotism of your employer, the University of Florida.

We, as a committee, realize that the great percentage, overwhelming percentage, of our American teachers and professors, are entirely loyal; and, again, I want to reiterate that no one should draw any inference from your testimony or your performance here that the University of Florida or its student body is in any way more disloyal or more unpatriotic than any other university in the country.

Is there any reason why this witness should be retained under subpena any longer?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness is dismissed.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Courtney E. Owens.

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. OWENS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF COURTNEY E. OWENS

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. OWENS. Courtney Owens.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you employed?

Mr. OWENS. As an investigator by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been employed as an investigator for this committee?

Mr. OWENS. Five years this September.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Owens, in the performance of your official duties, did you go to Florida for the purpose of conferring with Professor Reynolds?

Mr. OWENS. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to his being subpenaed before this committee?

Mr. OWENS. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have a conference with him?

Mr. OWENS. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date?

Mr. OWENS. March 26, 1953.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly, please, what occurred?

Mr. OWENS. I first contacted Professor Reynolds on the evening of March 25 at his home by telephone, and identified myself and said that I would like to see him at his earliest convenience. He stated it wouldn't be convenient for him to see me that night, but he made an appointment to meet me at 9 o'clock the morning of the 26th.

I met him on the morning of the 26th at 9 o'clock, and he advised me that he had made arrangements for our interview to take place in the offices of the dean of the University College and that he desired to have his department head present at the interview; and I asked him very pointedly whether or not he wanted me to ask him the questions that I had planned to ask him in the presence of his dean and his department head, and he replied that he did.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. VELDE. I understand he was not under oath at that time?

Mr. OWENS. He was under no oath; no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, as a result of the request that he made of you, did the interview take place in the presence of the dean of the university?

Mr. OWENS. It was in the dean's office; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly what occurred there?

Mr. OWENS. I interviewed the professor with respect to his identification by Professor Davis before this committee as having been a member of the Communist Party and told him that he had been identified by Professor Davis, and asked him pointedly whether or not

this identification was true and correct. He stated that he could think of no reason as to why Professor Davis should identify him as a member of the Communist Party. He denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did you inquire from him at that time as to whether or not he was a member, had been a member of the American Federation of Teachers while at Harvard University?

Mr. OWENS. Yes, sir; he volunteered that information when relating to me his employment background and where he had been employed since leaving school.

Mr. TAVENNER. So, he did state at that time before other persons besides yourself the fact that he had been a member of that group?

Mr. OWENS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Are there any further questions by any members of the committee?

Mr. DOYLE. Were any notes or memoranda made of that discussion by you?

Mr. OWENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And when were they made?

Mr. OWENS. Right at the same time.

Mr. DOYLE. In the presence of the dean?

Mr. OWENS. In the presence of the dean.

Mr. DOYLE. And the head of the department?

Mr. OWENS. Head of the department. The subject and I were there.

Mr. VELDE. I understand—

Mr. DOYLE. I see you have before you on the table paper with notes and writing on it. Are you now referring to the notes you made at the time of the conference?

Mr. OWENS. That is the transcription of the notes I made. This is my report; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Made from your original notes made at the time—

Mr. OWENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). That Professor Reynolds was in conference with you and the two college men?

Mr. OWENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. You have testified to everything that is in that memorandum?

Mr. OWENS. Yes; I have.

Mr. VELDE. And at that time the professor whom we have just heard, Professor Reynolds, denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. OWENS. Denied that he had ever been or was presently.

Mr. VELDE. And denied his present membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. OWENS. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is excused.

The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock Wednesday morning, the 29th.

(Whereupon, at 11:56 a. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., Wednesday, April 29, 1953.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Amdur, Isadore	1076, 1079
Arguimbau, Lawrence	1076
Bentley, Elizabeth	1085
Biberman, Herbert	1121
Blaisdell, B. E.	1076
Bridges, Harry	1078, 1080, 1121
Browder, Earl	1078, 1079, 1089-1091, 1095, 1099, 1100
Browder, Felix	1090-1093, 1103
Carleton, William Graves	1135
Cort, Joe	1128
Chambers, Whittaker	1085
Davis, Robert Gorham	1075, 1087, 1088, 1133, 1134, 1144, 1145
DeMaio, Ernest	1121
Dewey, Thomas E.	1096
Dontzin, Ben	1129
DuBois, W. E. B.	1120
Dugochet, Helen	1112
Fast, Howard	1121
Fine, Daniel	1128
Gold, Ben	1121
Goldstein, Theodore (Teddy)	1107, 1108-1124 (testimony)
Hartman, Fanny	1111
Hicks, Granville	1088, 1098
Higgins, Vickery	1091
Hiss, Alger	1085
Hoover, J. Edgar	1082, 1099, 1106
Kahn, Albert	1121
Levinson, Dr. Norman	1073-1107 (testimony), 1134
Levy, Arthur	1124-1131 (testimony)
Martin, William Ted	1074-1076, 1079, 1090, 1105, 1134
Mitzberg, Theodora (<i>see also</i> Theodora Goldstein)	1108
Moore, Harry	1115, 1116
Moore, Mrs. Harry	1115, 1116
Nixon, Russ A.	1076
Owens, Courtney E.	1135, 1143, 1144-1145 (testimony)
Philbrick, Herbert	1102, 1111-1113, 1117, 1118
Polumbaum, Ted	1129
Rackliffe, Jack	1076
Rand, Stuart	1073-1107
Rein, David	1124-1130
Reynolds, John Henry	1075, 1131-1143 (testimony), 1144, 1145
Robbins, Herbert	1075, 1077, 1134
Robeson, Paul	1121
Robinstein, Emmanuel	1128
Russo, Mike	1129
Schappes, Morris	1096
Shubow, Lawrence D.	1108-1124
Shuldiner, Bernard	1127
Sirota, Alex	1121
Struik, Dirk	1077
Sweezy, Paul	1075
Thoreau, Henry	1106
Travis, Maurice	1121

	Page
Winston, Woodward Little	1135
Woerner, Hal	1129
Zilch, Paul	1129
Zilsel, Paul	1129

ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Scientific Workers	1103
American Civil Liberties Union	1079
American Federation of Teachers	1137, 1145
American Labor Party	1127, 1128
American Peace Crusade	1120, 1121
American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace	1120
Bellevue Hospital	1108
Brown University	1133
Cambridge University (England)	1074
Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder	1079, 1097
Citizens' Political Action Committee	1112
Citizens United to Abolish the Wood-Rankin Committee	1097
College of Physicians and Surgeons	1108
Columbia University	1108
Federal Bureau of Investigation	1105-1107, 1111
Harvard University	1133, 1134, 1137, 1145
Henry Thoreau Group	1103
Hunter College	1108
Jefferson School of Social Science	1103
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee	1111, 1112
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1074-1078, 1090, 1104, 1105, 1134
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties	1080, 1089
New England Conference for Peace	1119-1121
New York University Medical School	1108, 1109
Peace Information Center	1120
Peace Pilgrimage	1121
Princeton University	1190
Princeton University, Institute for Advanced Study	1074
Progressive Citizens of America	1110-1112
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	1124, 1126
Samuel Adams School	1101-1103
Schappes Defense Committee	1097
Tri-City Civil Liberties Committee	1128
University of Florida	1132, 1137, 1138, 1143
University of Michigan	1133, 1137
University of New Hampshire	1133
World Federation of Scientific Workers	1103
Yale University	1129

PUBLICATIONS

Daily Worker	1077, 1078, 1120
I Led Three Lives: Citizen—"Communist"—Counterspy	1112
New Masses	1089, 1099, 1102
New York Herald Tribune	1091
New York Times	1096, 1097
Teheran—Path of War and Peace	1089
Victory in Africa	1089



